

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 237

SP 020 190

AUTHOR Wanous, Donna S.; Sparks, Dennis C.
TITLE Analysis of Individualized Teacher Center Services. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Inst. for Research on Teaching.; Northwest Staff Development Center, Livonia, MI.
SPONS AGENCY Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif. Teachers' Centers Exchange.
PUB DATE [82]
NOTE 121p.
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cost Effectiveness; *Delivery Systems; Educational Needs; Educational Resources; *Individualized Instruction; Locus of Control; *Participant Satisfaction; *Program Improvement; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Centers; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Workshops; Teaching Methods; Use Studies

ABSTRACT

The characteristics of individualized services offered by the Northwest Staff Development Center in Livonia (Michigan) to teachers in seven school districts were studied and a user profile was sought as a measure of program effectiveness. Services were requested directly by individual teachers and administrators to meet specific needs. Requests for services by 277 practitioners and the results of interviews with 51 users conducted by volunteer teachers were analyzed. The inquiry established: (1) characteristics of an individualized delivery system; (2) the difference between individualized service and other teacher center delivery systems; (3) the relationship between the type of service request and selected user characteristics; (4) the differences between teachers who made frequent requests and those who made few requests; (5) the networking effect among teachers who used individualized services; (6) the role of the school principal in the process; and (7) the impact of the services on educators' job-related behaviors and their perception of student achievement. The typical frequent user was an experienced female elementary school teacher who found the experience rewarding both personally and professionally and who saw improvement in student performance as the result of her request. Appended are a description of the center activities, copies of individualized service request forms, an interview form, and responses to the research questionnaire. (Authors/JD)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED218237

Analysis of Individualized Teacher Center Services

Final Report

Donna S. Wanous
Michigan State University

Dennis C. Sparks
Northwest Staff Development Center

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

DONNA S. WANOUS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This research was supported by a grant from the Program for Research
on Experienced Teacher Centers, Teachers' Center Exchange, Far West
Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

SP 020 190

Abstract

While teacher centers are usually designed to meet the unique needs of individual educators, little is known about the process and impact of individualized teachers' center services. During the past two years, hundreds of teachers and administrators have individually requested assistance from the Northwest Staff Development Center (NSDC) to address the pressing concerns of their work. Although these individualized services are popular with practitioners, NSDC has had little opportunity to assess the short and long term effect of these services on the requesters and/or their students.

The purpose of this study was to describe the characteristics of individualized services and the practitioners who used those services. For the purpose of this study individualized services are defined as those forms of assistance that may be requested directly by teachers and administrators through the use of a "Request for Services" form. Seven specific research questions were addressed in the study.

The research design of this study consisted of three phases. The major foci were the analyses of the documents associated with a sample of 562 requests (out of 2,218) made by 277 (out of 1,109) practitioners, and the analyses of 51 interviews conducted by 10 teachers.

The preliminary results of these analyses indicate that a description of the characteristics of an individualized service would include the following: 1) it was a workshop attended within the state; 2) the focus of the workshop was on either new teaching techniques or new information; and 3) the center provided reimbursement for a substitute and conference fees. Individualized services differ from other teacher center services in that they are initiated by the teacher alone and that they provide "something for everyone."

The person making the request was usually a female elementary school teacher with a master's degree and about 17 years of teaching experience. If she/he made frequent requests (more than seven) for services, she was even more likely to be female and to attend the activity alone.

The overwhelming tone of all the data collected was extremely positive. Eighty-three per cent of the participants reported being very satisfied with the individualized service. It was clear that the teachers believed that the experience "made a big difference" and that they were extremely unhappy to see the center close.

Acknowledgements

By its very nature, collaborative research is based on the cooperative efforts of various individuals and institutions. This was particularly true in this instance. First and foremost, we would like to thank this project's teacher-interviewers: Julia Hollingsworth and David Culler (Garden City Schools), Mike Abbott and Harriet Larson (Livonia Schools), Bill Boyer (Cherry Hill Schools), Harriet Hartman (Redford Union Schools), and Ann Neiswander (Plymouth-Canton Schools). Their suggestions improved the quality of the interview questionnaire and their persistent probing elicited responses that enriched the quality of our "hard data."

Our thanks also go to Northwest Staff Development Center Policy Board members who reviewed our findings: Ron Campau and Arthur Domalske (Livonia Schools), Julia Hollingsworth (Garden City Schools), Barabara LeBoeuf (Northville Schools), Connie Peterson (Plymouth-Canton Schools), Elaine Miller (Redford Union Schools), and Norene Daly (Madonna College). Their perspective and insight helped us understand what we had found.

We would like to extend our special appreciation to Joanne Kennedy and Irene Dabkowski for typing of questionnaires, coding data, attention to detail, and general good spirits, and to Joni Munson for typing this manuscript. Last, but not least, we want to acknowledge the support and encouragement throughout this endeavor of the Livonia Public Schools, especially Assistant Superintendent Arthur Domalske, and the Institute for Research on Teaching at Michigan State University.

Table of Contents

Abstract	1
Acknowledgements	2
Context of Study	3
Rationale of Study	5
Significance of Study	5
Statement of Research Objectives	6
Methodology	9
Results	18
Personal Reflections	38
Appendices	42
Appendix A: The Northwest Staff Development Center	
Appendix B: Request Forms	
Appendix C: Coding Formats	
Appendix D: Interview Form and Summary Results	

Tables and Figures

Figure 1: Phases and Variables	8
Table 1: Breakdown of Requests by District and User Categories for Population	11
Table 2: Percentage Comparisons: Sample vs Population	12
Table 3: Strengths and Weaknesses of Individualized Delivery Systems	23
Table 4: Range of Requests for Districts by Schools	28

Context of the Study

Hundreds of teachers are losing their jobs due to declining enrollment. Dozens of schools are being closed and teachers are involuntarily reassigned to unfamiliar grade levels or subject areas. Morale is at an all time low.

With the loss of younger teachers because of reductions-in-force and with more than 75 percent of the staff already having advanced degrees, few new ideas or strategies enter the classroom from colleges and universities. School faculties are getting older; the average teacher in one district is more than 50 years of age. Countless negative experiences have given "inservice education" a bad reputation.

These were the conditions facing the Northwest Staff Development Center. (NSDC) when it began operating with federal Teacher Center Program funds in 1973 (see Appendix A). Several questions were of immediate concern to the Center's Policy Board and staff: What services would appeal to 3,800 teachers and administrators in seven diverse school districts? How could a "site-less" Center "reach out" to teachers in their classrooms? How would NSDC programs reflect and model what is known about teaching, learning, and adult development?

NSDC's response was to provide a multi-layered set of services that would be responsive not only to the concerns of individuals and small groups, but could also assist a building faculty, a total school district, or, when appropriate, and across district boundaries. "Individualized services" and "Mini-Awards" were directed at the individual and small group. Schools and school districts could request assistance (workshops, consultants, etc.), while programs of multi-district appeal (e.g., motivating students, learning centers, etc.) were offered at the Center or other convenient location for teachers and administrators.

Teachers' feelings of apathy and sense of powerlessness were of particular concern to NSDC's staff. Negative attitudes toward inservice education also could not be ignored. For these reasons, it was important that the Center's services be of consistently high quality. Likewise, teachers had to feel like they were listened to, that someone cared about their problems, and that their choices of professional development activities were respected.

NSDC was successful in achieving these goals. Thousands of teachers voluntarily attended workshops and other programs. Hundreds of educators received Mini-Awards for self-directed instructional and curriculum improvement. Hundreds of individuals requested services through the use of "Request for Service Forms" (see Appendix B) that were available in the principal's office. Dozens of teachers and administrators elected to serve on committees that shaped the Center's programs and activities.

In 1981 it became apparent that due to the declining support of the federal government for education and the fiscal crisis brought on by the recession in Michigan, NSDC's program would have to be substantially reduced, if it were to survive at all, after the expiration of its federal Teacher Center Program grant in September of that year. This reality led to an obvious question: Which Center services are most important, and upon what evidence will "survival" decisions be made? Because individualized services had proven to be immensely popular with teachers (more than 2,000 requests had been made to the Center), and little was known about their nature and impact, it was concluded that it would be worthwhile to investigate these activities further. An application for a research grant from the Teachers' Center Exchange was made in December, 1980. Funding for this study was approved for March, 1981 to January, 1982.

Rationale for the Study

While teacher centers must frequently address the effectiveness and cost efficiency of the various elements of their programs, the relative worth of various services must be considered and prioritized. For example, cost efficiency data was calculated for NSDC sponsored workshops. During the 1979-80 school year, NSDC presented 60 workshops for 1256 teachers and administrators at a cost of \$.87 per participant hour. This can be compared with an approximate cost of \$4.67 per participant hour (\$35 per substitute - 7 1/2 hours) to provide a substitute so that a teacher can plan, develop materials, etc. While these data alone may favor the use of workshops as an efficient use of the Center resources, little is known about the users of individualized services nor the long-term results of their efforts. Factors other than cost will need to be considered by the governing bodies of teacher centers as they make programmatic decisions. This information is currently unavailable.

Significance of the Study

The results of this study have potential significance in two areas. First, the results of this study should be useful to other teacher centers in Michigan and throughout the United States. Each center can identify what data are relevant to their own current and future operations. While each teacher center is unique, there will be some common characteristics and research questions. As Patton (1978) argued, we need to look for the overall patterns in these operations if we are to advance our knowledge. Second, since teachers were involved in the data collection, it is anticipated that they have developed some new skills and knowledge. For example, teachers

and the teacher center staff helped to analyze existing data, design interview forms, and conduct interviews. Hopefully these skills will continue to be useful to the teachers involved in the study.

Statement of Research Objectives

Problem Statement

There are a multitude of ways in which teacher centers deliver their various programs. These delivery systems range from statewide consortium-type workshops to responding to the specific requests of an individual teacher. The purpose of this study was to describe and examine the impact of the use of individualization in the delivery of teacher center program.

The term "individualized" refers to teacher center programs in which teachers are "allowed to begin at their own beginnings, draw on personal strengths, and learn at their own pace" (Feiman, 1977). At NSDC participation in these activities was voluntary and initiated by the teacher or administrator. These services attempted to meet the needs of individual educators.

Definition of Individualized Services

For the purpose of this study, "individualized services" included those forms of assistance that were requested directly by teachers or administrators by using the "Request for Services" form (see Appendix B). These forms were distributed to each of the approximately 100 schools in the seven districts served by NSDC. Any teacher or administrator could request assistance through the use of these forms. Support provided included release time, conference attendance fees, consultants, materials, or "other."

To be eligible for these services, requesters responded to three questions: What do you want to do?; Why do you want to do it?; and Who

else is involved? "Request for Services" forms were processed by NSDC's Assistant Director who approved funding based on the availability of less expensive funding options, the "face value" appropriateness of the activity, etc. Requesters were notified of the assistance the Center would provide within a few days through "Confirmation of Request for NSDC Services" form. They were also asked to complete a "Feedback" form assessing the value of the activity. "Request for Services" forms, "Confirmation of Request for NSDC Services" forms, and "Feedback" forms were kept on file for the period October 1, 1978 through September 30, 1980.

Research Questions

There were several phases involved in the process of providing teacher center services to an individual teacher or administrator. Within each of these phases there were factors which were considered variables for the purpose of this study. These phases and variables appear in Figure 1 and form a broad foundation for the following research questions and the data collection process:

1. What were the characteristics of an individualized delivery system?
2. How was it different from other teacher center delivery systems (e.g., workshops, Mini-Awards, etc.)?
3. Was there a relationship between the type of request for services and certain demographic and other characteristics of the teacher making the request?
4. Were teachers who made frequent requests different from teachers who made few or no requests?
5. Was there a "networking" effect among the teachers who used these centers' services?
6. What was the role of the school principal in the process?
7. What was the impact of these services on educators' job-related behaviors and their perception of student achievement?

FIGURE 1
PHASES AND VARIABLES

Initiation
Phase

Nature of Request
Nature of Requester

Response
Phase

Processing of Requests
by Administrators and
Teacher Center Staff

Experience
Phase

Professional Development
Experience

Post Experience
Phase

Nature of Feedback
Nature of Changes

Methodology

In the first part of this section the assumptions behind the methodology of this study are presented. This presentation is followed by a description of the population, sample and subsample along with the criteria for inclusion in either the sample or subsample. The procedures involved in the data collection are outlined as are the data analytic techniques.

Assumptions

As Patton (1974) pointed out, the study of individualized teacher center programs is difficult. For example, he argued that because this type of delivery system focuses on the individual, the individual teachers must be studied in detail. In order to deal with these difficulties, the framework of this methodology section was based on three assumptions.

Assumption 1: Given the complexity of this type of delivery system, the first assumption was that the perspectives of a variety of participants needed to be included. These participants included those judged relevant to previous research. It was hoped that by using methods of triangulation the study would yield results that are meaningful to individuals and groups.

Assumption 2: The second assumption was that neither quantitative techniques alone nor qualitative techniques alone would result in the most relevant findings. As a result, both types of research techniques such as clinical interviews and document analysis were combined with description quantitative analyses.

Assumption 3: The third assumption was stimulated by Patton's 1979 article. In this article Patton argued that researchers need to examine the question of the impact of the delivery system as opposed to asking the question of whether one system is "better" than another. Therefore this study was designed to provide a rich description of the delivery system and the users of the system.

Thus, in this study the methodology was designed to study the impact of this system of individualization on the process and the outcomes of teacher center professional development programs. The design focused on both intended and unintended events and consequences. While comparisons were made, these are only descriptive in nature.

Population

The results of the preliminary document analyses revealed that 1,109 people requested individualized services from 1978-1980. It should be noted that many of these people made multiple requests for service. Therefore, the number of requests per person was broken down into the following three categories: low user (1-3 requests); moderate user (4-6 requests); and heavy user (more than 7 requests).

The results of these breakdowns are presented in Table 1 by school district. The district with the highest percentage of heavy users was South Redford with 4%. The districts with the highest percentage of moderate users were South Redford and Cherry Hill with 15%. Northville with 99% had the highest percentage of low users.

These figures of the number of requests represent a total 2,218 requests for services. This is an average of 2 requests per person.

Sample

Given the size of the population, a decision was made to draw a random sample of users for more extensive document analyses. Two criteria were used in determining the size of the sample. First, for data analytic reasons, it was decided that a minimum of 200 users (not requests) or about 25% of the population would be sampled. Second, all heavy users would be included even if they were not drawn in the initial random sample.

The resulting sample consisted of 277 users and a total of 562 separate requests. Of these 277 users, 13 were heavy users.

As a check on the representativeness of the sample, the breakdowns of users obtained by districts was compared to the breakdown of users by district in the population. The results in Table 2 indicate that the sample did represent the population breakdown.

Table 1
Breakdown of Requests by District and User
Categories for Population

District	USER CATEGORY		
	Low (1-3)	Moderate (4-6)	Heavy (7)
Livonia	424/96*	15/3%	2/1%
Garden City	120/91%	10/8%	2/1%
Plymouth-Canton	231/95%	11/4%	2/1%
South Redford	71/89%	14/16%	4/4%
Cherry Hill	59/83%	11/16%	1/1%
Redford Union	58/91%	4/6%	2/3%
Northville	67/99%	1/1%	0/0%

* Total number of requests/percentages of requests

Table 2
Percentage Comparisons
Sample vs Population

District	% of Requests	
	POPULATION (n = 1109)	SAMPLE (n = 561)
Livonia	39.5%	34.0%
Plymouth-Canton	21.0%	16.0%
Garden City	12.0%	15.0%
South Redford	8.0%	15.0%
Cherry Hill	6.5%	8.0%
Northville	6.0%	5.0%
Redford Union	6.0%	7.0%

Subsample

A random subsample was drawn from the sample of 277 users for the interview phase. The criteria for determining the size of the subsample were based on how many interviews an interviewer could realistically be expected to do and how many users they would not be able to locate given the high rate of teacher lay-offs in the districts.

The final subsample contained 63 users. Of these, 12 could not be located, leaving a subsample of 51 users or 18% of the sample and 4.6% of the population. The sample and subsample are described in more detail in the section entitled typical user.

Procedures

There were several steps involved in the conduct of this study. Those procedural steps are presented here with a brief summary of the activities completed during each step.

I. Preliminary document analysis. In this step both researchers reviewed the existing center files consisting of the following three forms: request for services, confirmation of request, and feedback forms. The purpose of this activity was to determine the best process for summarizing the data contained on the forms in relation to the research questions.

As a result, a decision to draw a random sample was made. In addition, a coding system was developed (see Appendix C) to allow the data to be computer analyzed.

II. Extensive document analysis of the sample. A sample of 562 requests were analyzed using various descriptive statistics. In addition to the analyses of the data for the entire sample, the data from the heavy user group were analyzed separately. Comparisons across the two groups were then calculated.

III. Interview form developed. Given the results of step II and the research questions, an interview form was developed (see Appendix D). The form was designed to collect more information about the users themselves and to probe for more details about their experiences with individualized services.

IV. Interviewer training session conducted. An intensive one-day training session was conducted for all interviewers. In addition, the interviewers provided the researcher with feedback about the interview form. As a result, the interview form was revised into its final form. (See results section for further details.)

V. Interviews were conducted. The interviews were conducted on a subsample of 51 users during September and October of 1981. On October 12, 1981 a

debriefing session was held with all the interviewers to discuss their findings and the impact of the experience on them.

VI. Interview data analyzed. During this step a coding system was developed for the interview form (see Appendix D). In addition to the computer analyses of the interview data, all descriptive data from the open-ended responses were summarized for each item (see Appendix D).

VII. Preliminary draft prepared. The preliminary draft of the final report was prepared by the researchers. Prior to its preparations the researchers met to jointly interpret the results of the data analyses.

VIII. Advisory meeting held. A meeting of the interviewers and the advisory board of the center was held to receive their reactions to the preliminary draft of the final report. In addition, their help in the interpretation of the data was solicited.

Data Analyses

There were three data analytic efforts: document analysis, interview analysis, and overall analysis. While the researchers took primary responsibility for these efforts, other relevant groups (e.g.: Policy Board members and interviewers) were involved in the data analysis at various points.

In these three data analytic efforts two major categories of data resulted from the coding systems that were developed. The first body of data was the information that could be quantified. Descriptive statistics and relevant cross tabulations were calculated for each item. In some cases chi square analyses were calculated to determine if the distributions were significantly different than expected.

The second body of data was the answers to the open ended questions that could not be codified. Lists of these responses were tabulated and then searched for common themes and patterns.

In the process of analyzing both sets of data, the data were subdivided into the three user groups. The groups were then compared on crucial variables.

In the overall analyses the results from the document analysis and the interview analysis were integrated. The results were analyzed for common themes and patterns. In addition, the results were examined for unintended events and consequences. During this phase, the views of the various participants were coordinated through the use of triangulation. Through this process, the variety of perceptions related to any given question were compared.

Since the major purpose of this study was to describe the nature of individualized services, no further statistical analyses were conducted. It is anticipated that additional analyses will be conducted in the future in light of the preliminary findings.

The findings reported here are a summary of a tremendous amount of data. The reader should be aware of the fact that data from the document analyses and the interviews are combined. The authors have tried to indicate where conclusions are based on interview data alone. All open ended interview responses are presented in Appendix C.

Results

The results of this study will be presented in three sections. In the first section a description of the typical user and the individualized service they used will be provided. The second section will be organized around the results related to each of the seven research questions and the purposes of the study. In the final section, suggestions and implications for other teacher centers and professional development in general will be discussed.

Typical User

The typical user of this service was a female elementary school teacher with a master's degree and about 17 years of experience. She was highly involved in professional activities including attending workshops and conventions; taking graduate courses; and participating in activities of professional committees. This user is also a participant in activities outside their own classroom and district. These activities included PTA, booster clubs, own local district curriculum committees and mileage committees for League of Women Voters.

She is not currently very involved in a professional association (union) although she may have been in the past. Her belief is that she has a great deal of control and responsibility over her own learning and professional development. She also believes that her own professional learning has a direct impact on the achievement of her students.

This typical user enjoys being a classroom teacher and perceives that she will remain a classroom teacher until retirement. She is able to articulate a variety of activities that she would like to bring into her classroom or other grade levels she would like to teach.

This typical user learned about individualized services through the center's newsletter. She has participated in more than one of the center's activities.

The typical activity she participated in was a workshop held outside of the districts in the consortium but within the state. The content of the workshop was either new information or new teaching techniques and she attended it by herself.

From the center, she received reimbursement for her conference fees and a substitute for 1 - 1½ days.

She believed the benefactors of the workshop were her students. She thought that both students' achievement and behavior were changed as a result.

Her satisfaction with the workshop was high. She shared whatever she learned in the workshop on an informal basis with her colleagues.

Research Questions

I. What were the characteristics of an individualized delivery system?

The individualized services provided by NSDC were utilized by 32% of the staff members (1,196) across the seven districts. The usage varied across districts and grade levels. Livonia had the greatest involvement and Northville had the least. Cherry Hills had the greatest percentage of secondary people involved while Northville had the greatest percentage of elementary school involvement. During the 1978-80 school year, the largest number of requests were processed.

The individualized delivery system consisted of the following stages: 1) knowledge about individualized services; 2) request for services; 3) the NSDC's response to the request; 4) receipt of the services; and 5) evaluation of the services (see Figure 1). A distinction is made here between the individualized delivery system which included the entire process of obtaining an individualized service and the individualized service itself. A description of the characteristics of each stage is provided below along with the identified strengths and weaknesses of the system.

Participants usually learned about individualized services from either the NSDC newsletter (29.4%) or from colleagues (17.6%). Teachers perceived the services as offering a "shot-in-the-arm" (p. 25) because the variety of options did "just what it's trying to do - meeting individual needs" (p. 24).

The reasons most often cited for requesting a service were a classroom/student need, a personal need to learn or update oneself in a particular area, a suggestion by an administrator, or a building change such as a middle school merger. Another reason often cited was that a good initial experience with NSCD led participants to try another service provided by the center.

The actual services requested broke down into the following categories:

1) workshops - 64%; 2) other (e.g.: professional conference) - 11.7%; 3) curriculum development - 10.3%; and 4) visitations - 5%. Only 3% of these activities were outside of Michigan, while 54.3% were within the state but outside the individual school or the consortium. Curriculum development was most likely (50%) to occur at the school site. If the service was a workshop, the content usually described a new teaching technique or new educational information. Contrary to prior expectations, the content was rarely related to special education, school climate or discipline.

The participants usually attended these activities by themselves (53.9%). Curriculum development was the area that was most likely to involve more than five people. The more requests for individualized services participants made, the more likely they were to attend them by themselves.

While the staff of the NSDC originally described its role as approving requests and providing material support, it became clear during the conduct of the study that the staff also played a vital advisement role. When teachers would contact the center with a specific need, the staff would attempt to match the need with a service. If a service didn't exist, they encouraged and helped requesters to seek alternative solutions. This type of close one-to-one interaction appears to be an important characteristic of the system.

Of the requests submitted, only .2% were not approved and 8.9% were cancelled. In terms of the support requested from the center, only 6.4% were reduced in the amount of support granted.

The support most frequently supplied by the center was reimbursement for a substitute (66.5%) for 1-1 1/2 days. Reimbursement for fees was the

second most common (48.5%) request. It should be noted that 61.2% of participants incurred additional costs and 37.3% paid those costs themselves.

In evaluating the individualized services, the majority of teachers (83.9%) stated that what they had learned would help their students. They reported that the quality of the service had been very high (99.6%).

The major strengths and weaknesses associated with the system appear in Table 3. The most often cited strength related to participants feeling that their own needs were being met. Some sample quotes were (p. 25)

... pursue individual needs, interests at a time when you are needing them. It's a fantastic resource pool - dollars, experts, materials do implement and inform the recipient.

You can develop an area you need to - either weakness or strength area.

Causes teachers to stand back and think about needs - awakens latent talents.

Because you take your own needs assessment, you become knowledgeable of your own specialized needs and you can concentrate on those conferences and workshops that can enhance them.

Regarding the weaknesses of the system, the two most frequently mentioned were the amount of paperwork and the problem of motivating teachers to use the system. Some sample quotes (p. 26; 27) were

People may lack the initiative to initiate the process even if they know it's there.

Apathetic clientele will not do anything - support and encouragement closer to the teacher than the center is.

Some teachers need direction or they would choose the wrong workshops, etc.

Table 3
Strengths and Weaknesses of Individualized Delivery Systems

Strengths	Weaknesses
1. met individual needs 2. ease of paperwork 3. helps supplement local services 4. opportunity to interact with variety of colleagues 5. opportunity to go to another setting 6. freedom to select activity 7. increases sense of professionalism 8. recognition from other professionals 9. well organized	1. lack of follow-up in buildings 2. lack of time 3. preview of quality of workshops 4. too many options 5. requires self direction and initiative 6. requires administrator approval 7. no built-in checks and balances 8. problems with quality of substitutes

II. How was it different from other teacher center delivery systems (e.g.: workshops, Mini-Awards, etc.)?

The major difference between the individualized delivery system and other NSDC activities was that the individual teacher had to initiate the process. The individual had to identify a need and a potential solution as opposed to reacting to opportunities offered by the center itself.

Since many of the users were involved in other NSDC activities, there was an interest in knowing whether or not users differentiated individualized services. It is clear from the interview data that the participants did recognize this intentional distinction.

Teachers often discussed the importance of having their own individual needs met at a particular point in time. They perceived this time element as a crucial difference between the individualized services and other center services. With the other services, the participants stated that they had to wait for something to come to them or until a large enough group of faculty was interested in a particular topic before a service could be delivered.

III. Was there a relationship between the type of request for services and certain demographic and other characteristics of the teachers making the request?

Although there did not appear to be a relationship between any particular demographic variable and the specific individualized service requested, the educators who used the services did share some interesting characteristics. The most general demographic characteristics were described in the "typical user" section.

The other set of characteristics shared among these educators was related to their perception of professionalism relative to their classroom and their involvement in professional activities.

Of the interviewees, the majority were involved in a variety of professional activities besides those offered by NSDC. The top six activities were the following: 1) attended workshops or seminars (96%); 2) attended professional conventions (61%); 3) served on professional committees (59%); 4) attended graduate level courses (57%); 5) made presentations (37%); 6) had written articles (16%). However, 43% reported that they were currently "not very" involved in activities of their professional organizations. Only 26% reported being "very" involved in those activities.

When asked if they believed that they had control over their own professional development, 77% stated that they had a "great deal" of control. The interviewees also stated that they received a lot of stimulation from their colleagues (77%). They pointed out that one of the advantages of the individualized services was the opportunity to interact with other colleagues from outside their own schools.

Ninety per cent of the teachers reported that they believed that teaching was a profession. They stated that it required both skill and creativity to be a professional teacher. They also believed that teachers had unique knowledge about teaching which made them professionals (p. 42-43).

While 65% of the interviewers fell into the 36-49 years of age category, 78% believed that they would remain in teaching for the rest of their careers. The only changes they considered were the shifting grade levels or building sites. They reported that they were very happy as classroom teachers. They attributed this happiness to their own willingness to continue to grow as teachers and professionals.

The only groups who reported the desire to move out of their current positions were administrators or counselors. They usually cited roles in education such as assistant superintendent as the position to which they aspired.

IV. Were teachers who made frequent requests different from teachers who made few or no requests?

There were very few differences between the heavy users and the low users of the individualized services. The heavy users were more likely to be female, or elementary grade level teachers and to have used the services during the 1980-81 school year than were low users. They also attended more activities by themselves.

Regarding teachers who made no requests for these services, no data were collected directly from them. Instead, teachers who used the services were asked to speculate about teachers who did not take advantage of the services.

Interviewees identified two groups of nonusers: teachers who were burned out and had no motivation to be involved in any activities versus teachers who were insecure and would not use the services by themselves. They believed that the latter group needed other teachers for support. In addition, they felt that the variety of options available may have been too over-whelming for these teachers.

Participants also identified building support as a big motivating foci. Lack of time and problems with substitutes were also cited as potential detractors for some nonusers.

V. Was there a "networking" effect among the teachers who used these services?

Originally the researchers anticipated that a "networking" effect might exist across all the schools in the consortium. Did the flow of information about the center and its services form any discernable pattern? No pattern materialized across all the schools, but patterns did emerge within particular schools and within particular districts.

Of the heavy users, several were clustered in the same buildings. In addition, certain buildings had much higher rates of use (see Table 4). In reviewing these data, the teacher collaborators pointed out that in these sites, there was almost always an "advocate" of NSDC present. This person was usually a Policy Board member, specialist or heavy user of the center's facilities.

Once more than one teacher became involved, other teachers stated that in some instances peer pressure got them initially involved. Teachers also reported a sense of building comradery when several teachers in one building were utilizing the NSDC individualized services.

While word of mouth still seemed to be the most prevalent form of communication about the services, teachers and Policy Board members believed that the location of the NSDC was related to its heavy use within the Livonia school district. The fact that the NSDC was located in Livonia and that the Livonia school district was the host district appeared to increase the use of the center's individualized services within the Livonia district.

VI. What was the role of the school principal in the process?

While principals were required to approve all requests for individualized services, the researchers were interested in knowing if principals varied in

Table 4

Range of Requests for Districts by Schools

	DISTRICT						
	LIVONIA (189) ¹ 39/1,277 ²	GARDEN CITY (90) 9/443	PLYMOUTH CANTON (87) 20/930	SOUTH REDFORD (86) 7/207	CHERRY HILL (46) 5/149	REDFORD UNION (6) 10/314	NORTHVILLE (24) 7/326
SCHOOLS > 15 REQUESTS	Garfield Dickinson J.H. Churchill High Stevenson High	East High	Field	Vandenberg Pierce J.H.	None	Volney-Smith	None
SCHOOLS WITH 10-14 REQUESTS	Bentley High	Radcliff J.H. West High	None	None	Harrison Titus Jr/Sr High	Redford - Union High	None
NO REQUESTS	Hayes Johnson Nankin Mills Skill Center	Lathers Spec. Ed.	Farraud Geer East Middle	None	Fisher	Roosevelt Westland Pearson R.U. Day Trt. Center ACE	Silver Springs Meads Mill J.H.

¹ The total number of requests² Number schools in district/total number of staff.

their support of the process. Based on the interview data, it appears that there was great variability from school to school in the role that the principal assumed.

When asked what role their principal played, 24% of the teachers stated that their principal encouraged them, 6% said she/he only made the forms available, 28% reported little involvement of the principal and 19% reported no involvement at all. In the elaboration of these categories, principals appeared to fall on a continuum ranging from actually identifying activities that teachers should apply for being supportive but not initiating anything to providing no support to the extent that they didn't even know where the forms were.

In some cases where the staff did not receive support from the principal another faculty member served this support function. This person was often a specialist, a member of the NSDC Policy Board or an active user of any of the services provided by the center.

VII. What was the impact of these services on educator's job-related behaviors and their perception of student achievement?

Educators reported that these individualized services had a substantial impact on both their attitudes and behaviors (84%) as well as on their students' attitudes, behaviors (61%) and achievement (57%). Eighty-six per cent of the interviewees stated that they used what they had learned as a result of the individualized services in their classrooms. The majority of the teacher (82%) thought that what they learned was of direct importance to their students.

When asked if the concept of individualization of the services related to the individualizing they did in their classrooms, teachers stated that

it reinforced their own individualization. Most teachers reported that they had been individualizing prior to their own experience with NSDC but that they did gain some new ideas about how to individualize.

The teachers most frequently stated that the experience had changed their attitudes by increasing their enthusiasm, making them feel more positive about teaching, increasing their pride and motivation. They believed their classroom behaviors changed because of the new knowledge and skills they had acquired. It made one teacher "ready to dig in again" (p. 40).

Although teachers realized that it was difficult to draw a direct correlation between their own experience and changes in their students, they were quite articulate about exactly what those changes were. They believed their students had increased in motivation, self confidence and enthusiasm. They stated that their students' behavior had improved and that the students were more involved in classroom activities.

In the area of achievement some teachers had actually examined achievement data before and after they experimented with what they had learned. Teachers reported that student's test scores and grades increased. Teachers who had targeted children to work with (e.g.: special education), reported the largest gains. The improvement in the quality of their students' work was frequently cited.

Regarding benefits to other people, the participants stated that many had improved their relationships with their students' parents. They reported that the opportunity to share what they had learned with other faculty members was very rewarding and stimulating. This stimulation led to new plans with other faculty members and for themselves.

Additional Results

In addition to the seven research questions, another purpose of the study was to train teachers as interviewers. It was anticipated that this professional development experience would have long term benefits for the teachers. The following is a description of the training workshop and the subsequent impact of the interviewing experience on the participants.

Interviewer training workshop. Seven interviewers participated in a day-long workshop in late August. The interviewers were selected the the researchers because of their previous involvement with NSDC and their familiarity with its services. The training was conducted by the principal investigators. The workshop consisted of the following activities:

1. Warm-up activity (identify the most significant staff development activity you've experienced to this point to acquaint participants with one another and to focus thinking on staff development issues).
2. An overview of the study, including research questions, findings from the preliminary analysis of the forms, and the reasons for including interviews in the research design.
3. Guidelines for interviewing (e.g., use of open-ended probes, importance of recording all of the respondent's answer, etc. and questionnaire "conventions" (e.g., instructions to interviewers were typed in capital letters, etc.) were presented.
4. Participants practiced interviewing with questionnaires using "round-robin" and "paired interview" formats.
5. Suggestions for improving questions and format were solicited from the interviewers.
6. Logistical problems were addressed (e.g., how should interviewers and interviewees be matched, when would copies of the questionnaire be sent to them, etc.)

During the "debriefing session" for the interviewers held in October, interviewers expressed satisfaction with their training. Their only reservation

concerned the time lag of several weeks between the workshop and commencement of the interviews in mid-September. Interviewers reported that no interviews took less than half an hour, with most sessions lasting 45-60 minutes.

Impact of interviewing. It was expected that the training and interview experiences would be a professional development experience for the interviewers. The seven teacher interviewers attended a "debriefing" session in early October near the completion of all interviews. They were asked to discuss their general impressions of the interviews, interviewee responses to particular items, and questions that they thought might have been confusing or provided less valid information. The meeting was recorded and the tape was transcribed.

Excerpted below from the transcript are three representative reflections by interviewers that typify the professional value of this process for themselves.

"It (interviewing) helped my interactions with my peers and it helped me to learn about the creativeness of other individuals, the hard-working things that they're doing. It just blew my mind when I asked the questions about what else do you do (question 2) and they kind of smiled and chuckled and went on in some cases and most listed all the activities that they'd been involved in."

"I enjoyed going into the buildings. I thought that was a real learning experience for me. I went to a wonderful school with the most enthusiastic teacher. I think that's what really energized me - to see the enthusiasm of the teachers. I thought that was really wonderful ... I was impressed also with the quality and quantity of what the teachers are doing. I thought it was very good. It (interviewing) helps out with public speaking and communication also - to have people meet face to face."

"A thing that kind of impressed me is that I tend to think of myself as being a really hard worker at teaching. And I think that after a while you get yourself internalized at a point where you think that you're the only one that's like that, you know? Maybe that's just me. Then all of a sudden you find out and you talk to some of these people that there are a lot of people out there who are just busting their fannies trying to do a good job. And a lot of times, I don't think ever, is it because of the external reward. Almost all the rewards are internal kinds of things."

As can be seen, a primary benefit of this process for the interviewers was the connection they made with enthusiastic, competent colleagues. It was renewing for them to step outside their classrooms and schools to talk with their peers about professional topics that are seldom discussed in the teachers' lounge or faculty meetings. In addition, interviewers were provided with an opportunity to learn and practice interpersonal skills (e.g., initiating contact with "strangers," asking open-ended questions, probing, listening, etc.) that will be of benefit in their day-to-day interaction with students, parents, and colleagues.

Implications for Staff Development

Teachers' positive response to the availability of individualized services and their perceptions of the impact these activities had on their classroom practices and students' achievement/behavior has implications for district staff development programs. This process is respectful of individual differences, provides a unique form of needs assessment, and allows for a quick response to teachers' concerns with a minimum of bureaucratic "red tape." Individualized services make it possible for staff development efforts to "start where the learner (teacher) is."

Many school districts have fewer financial resources available today for professional development programs. It is especially important that staff development funds be invested in a manner that is both cost efficient and likely to have long-term impact. For these reasons, staff development in various locations has become synonymous with building level "school improvement" projects. In addition, these programs are usually highly visible and have political appeal to school boards and other funding sources. It is not uncommon for school improvement projects to address institutional factors such as communication, climate, and decision-making, and provide workshops to the faculty on areas of mutual concern (e.g., discipline, mainstreaming, gifted and talented education, etc.).

Individualized service programs and school improvement projects need not necessarily be seen in opposition to one another. Unfortunately, staff development programs sometimes forget individual needs as they pursue institutional goals. A comprehensive school improvement plan (e.g., articulation of curriculum) could also include funding for activities that may involve one teacher (e.g., developing learning centers, developing materials for special students, etc.).

Several "realities" of school life make it particularly important that individualized services not be forgotten when scarce staff development funds are allocated. Building level or district wide programs are usually long-term projects, and depend for their success on a set of "core conditions" (e.g., a supportive superintendent or principal, district commitment to the project, the availability of appropriate consultants and other resources, the absence of confounding problems such as school closing and the widespread reassignment of staff, etc.). However, many teachers (and their students) cannot wait months or years for assistance. They need immediate help applied to their unique situations. While it cannot be denied that building support mechanisms may increase the probability that materials or a strategy will be applied effectively in the classroom, many competent teachers are able to acquire and use learnings within hours or days without any additional prodding or encouragement.

Another reality in many school districts is the cumulative frustration and apathy that teachers have developed as they worked on various committees that ultimately served no tangible purpose. Information regarding finances was withheld from participants, decision-making powers were limited, and reports were shelved by principals or superintendents. Many of these teachers are reluctant to become involved in school improvement projects because of a low trust level and feelings of hopelessness. However, individualized services often provide a mechanism to involve these persons in staff development and increase their sense of efficacy.

A final reality--for years to come there will be effective teachers who struggle to maintain their enthusiasm and skills within ineffective schools. There are also many gifted teachers who require continual challenge and

opportunities for growth. Individualized services provide a stimulus and a reward for teachers whose ongoing motivation and desire to stay in education may well depend upon such incentives.

It is possible for a school district to administer some form of an individualized staff development program with relatively little cost and effort. Most individualized services provided by NSDC were in the form of awards in the range of \$30 to \$50 for released time and conference registration fees. Partial financial support for the activity was often provided by the teacher. A committee of teachers and administrators could review requests for services based upon mutually agreeable criteria using forms similar to those in Appendix B. Local finances and the unique circumstances of the school district will dictate the most appropriate process for providing individualized services to teachers and administrators.

If schools are to continue to fund individualized services, there are several points to ponder and questions which remain unanswered as a result of this research. The points to ponder category includes those characteristics consistently cited by participants as key elements for the success of individualized services. Other institutions contemplating the use of individualized services may want to consider these points.

1. Teachers valued the opportunity to interact with colleagues from other schools within Michigan and outside of Michigan.
2. Having the opportunity to participate in a professional development activity designed to meet their own individual needs, increased teachers' sense of efficacy. They also were reinforced for their own self assessment of their needs.
3. A good initial experience was crucial in getting teachers to continue using the service and to tell other teachers about it.
4. The one-to-one interaction with NSDC staff during the process gave teachers that little extra push to actually participate. It made teachers believe they really were important as individuals.

5. Teachers believed that it was not possible to reach all teachers with any professional development activity. If individualized services are truly individualized, then they will not be appropriate for all teachers.

In discussing any weaknesses associated with individualized services, participants raised several questions which need to be answered.

1. How can individualized services be provided on-site?
2. How can the involvement of teachers at the secondary level be increased?
3. How can you provide an endless number of options for participants without overwhelming them?
4. How can a professional development staff help teachers accurately identify their own personal professional development needs?
5. How can the problem of lack of time be circumvented?

Personal ReflectionsDr. Sparks

There were not many surprises for me in this research. I believed that teachers valued individualized services and were satisfied with the experience. That was confirmed. It seemed likely that teachers would be motivated to apply in their classrooms learnings that resulted from self-selected activities. And because teachers are close to their students' problems, it makes sense that their judgments about what would make a difference in their classrooms would quite often be correct. These things were also confirmed in this study.

It was recognized at NSDC that no one method of service delivery or single type of activity (e.g., workshops, make-and-take, etc.) would appeal to all teachers. In addition, it seemed important that the Center model respect for individual variations in learning style and previous experience. NSDC had no business advocating a developmental, individualized approach to students unless it could develop a parallel process for adult learners. Consequently, it was satisfying to see that a majority of the interviewed teachers thought that their efforts at individualizing instruction were reinforced or expanded because of their use of individualized services.

We hoped that the Center might play a role in empowering teachers. If successfully implemented, individualized services would cause teachers to feel more in control of their professional development. While these services may have appealed more to "inner directed" teachers, 78 percent of those interviewed said that they had a great deal of control over their learning and professional development, and 84 percent perceived that their learning made a great deal of difference with student. I don't believe that similarly high percentages would be elicited from the general population of teachers.

It is also worth noting that 83 percent of the interviewed group intends to stay in teaching until retirement--an amazingly high number considering the pervasive sense of dissatisfaction among teachers today.

A perusal of the more than 2,000 requests that came to the Center in three years underscored for me the complimentary nature of individual needs and institutional goals. They are not mutually exclusive. Many individual requests were directly related to school or district needs: reassignment to an unfamiliar teaching area, the improvement of school climate, mainstreaming special education students, the use of computers in the classroom, etc. Both the individual and institutional ends of the staff development continuum must be kept in mind if long-term change is going to occur in a manner that affects classroom life in a meaningful way.

When NSDC closed in September, 1981, it seemed to many of us who were closest to the Center that we had failed to "institutionalize" our program. Yet two of the larger districts in the consortium have established individualized staff development services in a manner almost identical to that of the Center's process. These services have passed the hardest test in difficult financial times. Local districts have come to believe in their value and actively support their use.

Dr. Wanous

I was initially somewhat hesitant to become involved in this project because I did not know a lot about teacher centers. Fortunately I decided to become involved in what has proven to be an extremely positive experience for me.

Throughout the study, I have been continually struck by the level of enthusiasm of all of the educators with whom I have interacted. I found this particularly surprising in light of the difficult financial times for education

in Michigan, especially in these particular school districts. It was likely that many of the people I had met would be unemployed at the end of the year.

Three points became very clear to me as a result of my involvement in this study. First, the NSDC and its staff were very successful. It was almost impossible to find anyone who had had a negative experience with the center. I feel very confident in making this statement because I was the outside researcher and I had no vested interest in the center's success or failure.

Second, all the teachers who collaborated in this research as interviewers or interviewees confirmed my belief that teaching is a profession. I was especially struck by their ability to objectively evaluate their own profession and their colleagues.

Finally, this experience has reaffirmed my confidence in collaborative research. I believe all of us who were involved in this study learned a great deal from each other. I believe this knowledge enriched the study and gave it meaning.

The only negative aspect of my involvement in this study is the sadness I feel that the NSDC has been forced to close. I believe the closing of the center conveys a painful message to teachers who as professionals are concerned about the quality of the work they do.

References

Feiman, S. Evaluating teacher centers. School Review, 1977, 8, 395-411.

Patton, M. Reflections on evaluating teacher centers: The view from an iron cow. In S. Feiman (Ed.), Teacher Centers: What Place in Education? Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1978.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

The Northwest Staff Development Center

The Northwest Staff Development Center (NSDC) was a state and federally funded teacher center serving approximately 3700 teachers and administrators in seven school districts in northwest Wayne County, Michigan. It was governed by a Policy Board of teachers (9), administrators (7), and a representative of higher education. Ex-Officio members of the Policy Board represented the Michigan Education Association, the Wayne County Intermediate School District, Madonna College, and Schoolcraft College.

Initial efforts to develop a multi-district teacher center began in 1976. Teacher and administrator representatives from the seven consortium districts formed the Northwest Staff Development Council. For two years they coordinated multi-district inservice programs using local expertise and resources. In 1978 the Council received a federal teacher center grant. The NSDC consortium also received State of Michigan Professional Development Funds during the 1979-80 and 1980-81 school years. NSDC was staffed by a Director, Assistant Director, a half-time Training and Development Consultant from Wayne State University, a full time secretary and a half-time secretary. Application was made for funding to the Teacher Center Program, but a new grant was not awarded. The Center closed on September 30, 1981 with the completion of its three-year federal teacher center grant.

The Northwest Staff Development Center developed a multi-tiered system of services. It included: (1) individualized services (release time, conference fees, supplies, and consultant assistance) requested by teachers and administrators; (2) Mini-Awards (systematic ongoing projects initiated by participants); (3) workshops provided to the staff of a single school; (4) building level staff development teams (20 teams have been trained at

this point); (5) multi-district workshops and Consortium Days (large scale multi-session inservice program). Total funding for the Center was approximately \$133,000 in 1978-79, \$220,000 in 1979-80, and \$180,000 in 1980-81. Of this amount, \$14,000 was available for individualized services in 1978-79, \$40,000 in 1979-80, and \$27,000 in 1980-81.

Appendix B

NORTHWEST STAFF DEVELOPMENT CENTER
Rosedale School - 9825 Cranston, Livonia, Michigan 48150 - 261-7440

REQUEST FOR SERVICES*

Requester's Name _____ Date _____
Position _____ School _____
School Telephone _____ District _____

REQUESTS FOR SERVICES MUST BE SUBMITTED TO NSDC
TEN WORKING DAYS IN ADVANCE OF THE SERVICE.

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AS COMPLETELY AS POSSIBLE:

1. What do you want to do? Why do you want to do it?

2. Who else is involved? (Please give names and positions)

3. What services will be needed? Please estimate the cost for each service.

Substitutes: _____ on _____ at \$ _____ per day
Number of days Date(s) COST \$ _____

Consultant: _____ (name or topic)
on _____ (dates) \$ _____

Conference Registration Fees _____ (Title/Topic)
on _____ (dates) \$ _____
(Please attach a copy of conference program)

Materials (please itemize): _____
_____ (Must be ordered through NSDC) \$ _____

OTHER (please itemize): _____ \$ _____

TOTAL \$ _____

ALL REQUESTS FOR SERVICES ARE SUBJECT TO BUILDING AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL.

Signature of applicant: _____

Signature of building administrator: _____

White - NSDC
Pink - NSDC Policy Board Administrative
Canary - member for your district
Blue - Building Administrator
Blue - Retain for your records

* This is not a Mini-Award form.
7/86

NSDC POLICY BOARD ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS

Cherry Hill - James Potter	Garden City - Charles Gumina	Livonia - Esther Heusner	Northville - Nancy Soper
Plymouth/Canton - Dr. Michael Homes	Redford Union - Dr. Ken Erickson	South Redford - Dr. Jan Jacobs	

NORTHWEST STAFF DEVELOPMENT CENTER
Roseale School - 9825 Cranston, Livonia, Michigan 48150 - 261-7440

TO: _____ Date: _____
FROM: Dennis Sparks; Nancy Allan School: _____
SUBJECT: Confirmation of Request for NSDC Services District: _____

_____	Substitute for _____	\$ _____
	* Date(s) Purpose	
_____	Conference Registration Fee for _____	\$ _____
	Reimbursement does not include meals, lodging or transportation expenses. YOU MUST PAY YOUR OWN REGISTRATION FEE, THEN SUBMIT RECEIPT TO NSDC FOR REIMBURSEMENT.	
_____	Consultant _____	\$ _____
	(To be contracted by NSDC unless otherwise specified.)	
_____	Supplies _____	\$ _____
	(Must be ordered through NSDC. Please tell us <i>specifically</i> what supplies you need.)	
_____	Other _____	\$ _____
	TOTAL	\$ _____

Substitute days should be requested several days in advance to facilitate central office processing. We assume that requests for substitutes and other services will be handled in accordance with district procedures. NSDC will reimburse your district for substitute days upon receipt of evidence of expenditures from the district.

WHEN REQUESTING SUBSTITUTE TIME, ATTACH A COPY OF THIS FORM TO YOUR PAYROLL TIME SHEET TO ASSIST CENTRAL OFFICE BILLING TO NSDC.

A condition of accepting NSDC assistance is completion of the attached questionnaire. Please return it to the Center no later than one week after receipt of services. Your cooperation will enable us to broaden the impact of our program through sharing your learnings with Center staff and other interested educators.

Dennis Sparks, Director

White - Requester of Services
Blue - Building Administrator
Green - NSDC Policy Bd. Admin. Member
Canary - NSDC

Nancy Allan, Assistant Director

NORTHWEST STAFF DEVELOPMENT CENTER
Wilcox Center, 29530 Munger, Livonia, Michigan 48154 261-7440

STAFF DEVELOPMENT FEEDBACK

Name: _____ Date: _____

School: _____ District: _____

Type of Service Received (please specify):

Substitute(s) _____

Conference _____

Workshop _____

Consultant _____

Materials _____

Other _____

Please respond to the following questions. Be as specific as possible.

1. Please provide a brief narrative of what you learned.
2. How might this inservice experience affect your teaching and/or student achievement?
3. How are you planning to share this experience with your building staff and/or other teachers?
4. Did this experience suggest any possible staff development activities that might be sponsored by the Center? Can you suggest resource people in these areas?

Appendix C

ADDITIONAL EXPLANATIONS FOR CODING

1. Identification number.

This number will have two parts. The first three digits (1 - 3) will be the number assigned to the person. I think the easiest way to do this would be to alphabetize within each district and number consecutively within the district.

The second part of the number would identify which number of request it was. If it was the person's second request, you would put a "2" in column 4.

For example, if John Doe is the 45th person in Livonia and he has made only one request, his identification number would be the following:

Columns 1-3 ⁰⁴⁵¹ ← Column 4

2. You should have the master list for the codes for school and district.

3. Student Achievement.

If the person mentions anything related to student achievement on the feedback sheet, you would record a "yes" response.

3. Feedback.

If you think that the overall tone of the feedback sheet was positive, you would check that response. This category will call for some judgements.

<u>Variable Name and Number</u>	<u>Code(s)</u>	<u>Column</u>	<u>Description</u>
1. I.D.	Personal number } Request number }	1 - 3 4	4.0
2. Year	'78 - '79 = 1 '79 - '80 = 2 '80 - '81 = 3	5	1.0
3. Sex	Male = 1 Female = 2	6	1.0
4. Position	Classroom Teacher = 1 Administrator = 2 Other = 3	7	1.0
5. School	see master list	8,9	2.0
6. District	see master list	10	1.0
7. Level	Elementary = 1 Middle = 2 Junior = 3 Senior = 4	11	1.0
8. What	Workshop = 1 Curriculum/materials develop = 2 Visitation = 3 Other = 4	12	1.0
9. Where	At School = 1 At NSDC = 2 Within Consortium = 3 Within State = 4 Out of State = 5	13	1.0
10. Who Else	1 - 4 people = 1 5 - 9 people = 2 10 + people = 3 Entire staff = 4	14	1.0
11. Substitute	yes = 1 no = 2	15	1.0
12. Consultant	yes = 1 no = 2	16	1.0
13. Conference	yes = 1 no = 2	17	1.0
14. Materials	yes = 1 no = 2	18	1.0

<u>Variable Name and Number</u>	<u>Code(s)</u>	<u>Column</u>	<u>Description</u>
15. Other	yes = 1 no = 2	19	1.0
16. Sub days	$\frac{1}{2}$ day = 1 1 - $1\frac{1}{2}$ days = 2 2 - $2\frac{1}{2}$ days = 3 3 + days = 4	20	1.0
17. Response	Approved = 1 Approved but reduced = 2 Not approved = 3	21	1.0
18. Focus (of learning)	Learning for me = 1. Helping my students = 2 Helping other staff = 3	22	1.0
19. Topic	Individualized instruction = 1 School climate = 2 Special Education = 3 Gifted and talented = 4 Stress/burnout = 5 New techniques = 6 (w/specific curr. content) Other = 7	23	1.0
20. Share	One-to-one interactions = 1 Inservice to Staff = 2 Informal sharing = 3 Written Reports = 4 Departmental meetings = 5 Other = 6	24	1.0
21. Student Achievement	If mentioned student achievement, then yes = 1 no = 2	25	1.0
22. Activities	If mentioned activities to share, yes = 1 no = 2	26	1.0
23. Names	If names for future were listed, yes = 1 no = 2	27	1.0
24. Feedback	If overall tone of evaluation was Positive = 1 Neutral = 2 Negative = 3	28	1.0

Appendix D

NORTHWEST STAFF DEVELOPMENT CENTER

Rosedale School, 9925 Cranston, Livonia, Michigan 48150 (313) 261-7440

INDIVIDUALIZED SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

Hello, my name is _____. I'm a teacher in _____ serving as an interviewer for the Northwest Staff Development Center in a study they are conducting for the Far West Laboratory in San Francisco. We would like to learn more about teachers who requested individualized staff development services from the Center, and what resulted from their use. Individualized services include conference attendance fees, released time, supplies, and consultant help. You asked for these services by completing a "Request for Service" form that was available in your principal's office. Your name, along with about 80 other teachers, was selected at random from approximately 1,200 teachers who have used these services.

The Center's records indicate that you received the following services during the past three years. (READ SERVICES THAT ARE LISTED BELOW TO TEACHER. NOTE ANY DISCREPANCIES.)

NAME: _____

SCHOOL NAME/DISTRICT: _____

SCHOOL ADDRESS: _____

SCHOOL TELEPHONE NUMBER: _____

	SERVICE	DATE
1.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____

(PAUSE FOR QUESTIONS.)

The answers you provide in this interview will be completely anonymous. Your name will not be attached to this questionnaire. The interview will take approximately 20-30 minutes. For each question I read I will provide a set of responses. Please listen to all the responses carefully, and select the answer or answers that is most correct for you at this time. First we'd like to learn more about you.

1. What is the highest degree that you've earned?

24% Bachelors
42% Masters
12% Educational Specialist
2% Doctoral

2. How many years experience in education do you have?

$\bar{X} = 17.8$ years

$S = 7.14$

3. At what grade level do you teach?

16% K-3
22% 4-6
6% 7-9
20% 10-12
26% multi-level (INDICATE LEVEL AND SPECIAL AREA.)
10% administrators

4. Did you first learn about the Northwest Staff Development Center through attendance at a CONSORTIUM Day program, through the newsletter, from the NSDC staff, from your principal or other administrator, from a colleague, or through some other means?

4% CONSORTIUM Day program
*1 24% NSDC newsletter
10% from NSDC staff
*2 16% from principal or other administrator
10% from a colleague
*3 22% other (PLEASE SPECIFY.)
9% more than 1

5. Did you learn about individualized services and the particular service(s) you requested through the newsletter, from the NSDC staff, from your principal or other administrator, from a colleague, or through some other means?

*1 30% NSDC newsletter
8% from NSDC staff
6% from principal or other administrator
*3 18% from a colleague
10% other (PLEASE SPECIFY.)
1% can't recall
*2 28% more than one

6. We'd like to know more about what other NSDC services that you've used. Have you attended a Center sponsored workshop at NSDC or in your building, participated in a Mini-Award project, attended a CONSORTIUM Day program, used the Center's facility (laminator, badge maker, etc.), been a member of a building level staff development planning team, or in some other way used the Center's services?

6% attended workshop
0% Mini-Award project
4% CONSORTIUM Day program
2% used the Center's facility
0% member of a building level staff development planning team
0% other (PLEASE SPECIFY.)
88% more than one

7. Sometimes teachers spent money for meals, transportation costs, or over-night lodging that was not included in the funds received from NSDC. Did you incur additional costs when using NSDC services?

61% Yes

39% No

(IF YES, ASK FOR ESTIMATE OF COST.)

(IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 8.)



Did your school district pay the additional costs, did you, or did someone else?

28% school district
66% yourself
3% other (PLEASE SPECIFY.)
10% more than one

8. You requested (READ SERVICES FROM FIRST PAGE). When you used these individualized services did you participate by yourself, with one or two others, or with more than two others? (RECORD NUMBER OF SERVICE FROM FIRST PAGE IN APPROPRIATE RESPONSE CATEGORY.)

43% by self
21% 1-2 others
36% more than 2 others

X
 across
 requests }

9. Did you use in your classroom any of the ideas, techniques, materials, or plans that you developed or acquired?

86% Yes 4% No 10% Not appropriate

Did these ideas, techniques, materials, or plans make a difference in your attitude and/or behavior as a teacher?

88% Yes 12% No

(IF YES, PROBE FOR SPECIFIC DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDE/BEHAVIOR.)

Did these ideas, techniques, materials, or plans make a difference in your students' attitude and/or behavior?

69% Yes 16% No 15% Not appropriate

(IF YES, PROBE FOR SPECIFIC DIFFERENCES IN STUDENTS' ATTITUDE/BEHAVIOR.)

Did these ideas, techniques, materials, or plans make a difference in your students' achievement?

76% Yes 24% No

(IF YES, PROBE FOR SPECIFIC DIFFERENCES AND EVIDENCE, IF AVAILABLE, OF DIFFERENCES IN STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.)

Sometimes things teachers learn in inservice programs make a difference for other teachers or the program of their school. You may have shared what you learned with others, or your suggestions may have helped change curriculum or the way things are done in your school.

10. Did your use of individualized services have a benefit for other teachers, your school program, or the school district as a whole?

22% other teachers

14% school program

2% school district

4% other

6% did not have benefit for anyone else

52% more than one

(PROBE FOR NATURE OF BENEFIT TO OTHERS AND PROCESS THROUGH WHICH SKILLS OR INFORMATION WERE SPREAD.)

11. Did your use of individualized services influence you to seek other NSDC services, such as workshops or Mini-Awards?

67% Yes 29% No 4% Not appropriate

(IF YES, PROBE TO FIND OUT NATURE OF INFLUENCE.)

12. NSDC has individualized staff development by allowing teachers to pursue their unique goals and interests. The use of "Request for Service" forms and Mini-Awards are two of the ways in which the Center has encouraged teachers to pursue their own goals and learn at their own rate. We would like to know if our attempts at individualizing your learning have had any effect on your efforts to individualize learning for your students. Did the Center's modeling of an individualized staff development program reinforce your efforts to individualize with students, cause you to implement or expand individualized learning in your classroom, or did it have little or no effect on what you did?

40% reinforce

21% implement or expand

39% little or no effect

(PROBE FOR NATURE OF EFFECT, IF ANY.)

13. Looking back at the quality of these services in general, would you say that you were very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with their quality?

84% very satisfied

16% somewhat satisfied

— somewhat dissatisfied

— very dissatisfied

14. During the past three years you specifically requested assistance from the Center to (IF NECESSARY, READ LIST OF SERVICES PROVIDED ON PAGE 1 TO TEACHER). Please recall in as much detail as possible the thought processes and decisions that caused you to request that specific activity (or activities) rather than something else you might have requested. (PROBE FOR WHY THEY ASKED FOR "MOTIVATION CONFERENCE" OR "TIME FOR PLANNING SCIENCE CURRICULUM" RATHER THAN SOMETHING ELSE.)

15. What do you consider to be the strengths of this process? (PROBE.)
16. What do you consider to be the weaknesses of this process? (PROBE.)
17. You probably know some teachers who did not request any individualized services from the Center in the past three years. Why do you think it is that some people reach out for this type of assistance while others do not? (PROBE FOR INITIAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN "USERS" AND "NON-USERS".)
18. We'd like to better understand the principal's role in this process. Did he or she encourage teachers to use this service, make the "Request for Service" forms easily accessible, suggest specific activities to teachers, little involvement (approved request), or no involvement? (PROBE "ENCOURAGED TEACHERS".)
- 24% encouraged teachers
- 67% made "Request for Service" form easily accessible
- 28% suggested specific activities to teachers
- 10 little involvement (approved request)
- 32 no involvement
- 32% more than me

We'd like to know more about how teachers renew themselves throughout their careers. The last few questions relate to that topic.

19. We'd like to know how you keep yourself learning and growing professionally. Do you receive stimulation and/or modeling from colleagues, read professional journals or books, attend workshops, take graduate courses, go to annual conventions or professional organizations, write articles, make presentations at conferences, serve on committees and boards, or other activities? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.)

77% receive stimulation and/or modeling from colleagues

88% professional journals/reading

96% workshops/seminars

57% graduate courses

61% annual conventions of professional organizations

16% write articles

37% make presentations at conferences

59% serve on professional committees or boards

28% other (SPECIFY)

20. How involved would you say you have been in the activities of your education association? Would you say you are very involved, somewhat involved, or not very involved at all?

27% very involved

29% somewhat involved

44% not very involved

(PROBE FOR NATURE OF INVOLVEMENT.)

21. We'd like to know more about professional involvements you have outside of your classroom. For example, some teachers serve on curriculum committees, are officers in professional organizations, or are members of community advisory boards related to education. Would you say that you have been very involved, somewhat involved, or not very involved at all in these types of things?

24% very involved

43% somewhat involved

33% not very involved

(PROBE FOR NATURE OF INVOLVEMENT, e.g., CURRICULUM COMMITTEES, ELECTED OFFICER, ETC.)

22. We'd like to know more about the extent to which you believe you have control over your own learning and professional development. Would you say that you have a great deal of control, some control, or little or little or no control? (PROBE.)

78% great deal of control

16% some control

6% little or no control

23. In reference to teaching and your students, would you say that your learning makes a great deal of difference, some difference, or little or no difference? (PROBE.)

84% great deal of difference

14% some difference

2% little or no difference

24. There is a great deal of speculation these days about whether teaching is a profession. A "profession" is often defined as a body of knowledge and skills possessed by the practitioner that is not generally known by everyone. Would you say that teaching is a profession? (PROBE.)

96% Yes 4% No

25. Do you believe that you will remain in education until retirement. (PROBE.)

83% Yes



What other positions or responsibilities would you like to assume? (PROBE.)

17% No



What might you do instead? (PROBE FOR CAREER FANTASIES, TENTATIVE PLANS, ETC.)

26. (ESTIMATE AGE OF INTERVIEWEE.)

270 21-28
1970 29-35
6570 36-49
1470 50 and over

27. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR OBSERVATIONS ABOUT INTERVIEW.

Appendix E

FAR WEST LAB RESEARCH STUDY

PROBE RESPONSES TO RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

FAR WEST LAB RESEARCH

RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUALIZED SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE:

QUESTION 1: What is the highest degree that you've earned?

-- No added responses.

QUESTION 2: How many years experience in education do you have?

-- No added responses.

QUESTION 3: At what grade level do you teach?

- K-6 Instructional Materials Center
- Secondary Teacher/Advisor for Gifted.
- Title I
- Learning Specialist, K-6.
- Multi-level/Resource Room.
- Multi-level/Elementary Gifted.
- Multi-level/Learning Specialist, Instructor at EMU, Presenter of workshops in Wayne/Washtenaw County.
- Talented & Gifted, Grades 3-6.
- Special Education, Grades 1-6.
- Counselor

QUESTION 4: Did you first learn about the Northwest Staff Development Center through attendance at a CONSORTIUM DAY program, through the newsletter, from the NSDC staff, from your principal or other administrator, from a colleague, or through some other means?

- I don't remember. (3)
- Work on Policy Board.
- From Julia Hollingsworth.
- Workshop.
- Policy Board members in district.
- Curriculum Department (before NSDC was formed)
- Union - Initial support.
- Dennis Sparks presented concept at learning specialist meeting.
- Elaine Miller at teacher meeting.
- Inservice at school.

QUESTION 5: Did you learn about individualized services and the particular service(s) you requested through the newsletter, from the NSDC staff, from your principal or other administrator, from a colleague, or through some other means?

- Through the Curriculum Council.
- Helped to plan it.
- It varied.
- Consortium Day.
- Newsletter from ECA.
- Newsletter, very well done -- great!
- With colleague -- we were searching for a way to get Historical Society materials in hands of Livonia classroom teachers -- it worked!
- Memo to teachers for volunteers to participate on NSDC's administrative committee.
- Esther Heusner, Department of Curriculum.
- Union.
- Learning Specialist on NSDC Board.
- Brochures to conferences and workshops sent out by organization.

QUESTION 6: We'd like to know more about what other NSDC services you've used. Have you attended a Center sponsored workshop at NSDC or in your building, participated in a Mini-Award project, attended a Consortium Day program, used the Center's facility (laminator, badge maker, etc.), been a member of a building level staff development planning team, or in some other way used the Center's services?

- Used REMC (Regional Educational Media Center).
- Got money for teachers' pay to work on integrating special education kids into regular classroom.
- Was a "presenter" at Consortium Day (a rewarding experience).
- Used Center as a resource for information when doing research. They referred me to REMC as another source.
- Our district was never able to attend.
- Staff Development Council prior to administrative position.
- NSDC was very supportive and helpful -- if they couldn't get it, they referred me to someone else.
- Talked to Dennis Sparks, NSDC Director, about problem.
- Exercise Program, Puppet Workshop.

QUESTION 7: Sometimes teachers spent money for meals, transportation costs, or overnight lodging that was not included in the funds received from NSDC. Did you incur additional costs when using NSDC services?

(IF YES, ASK FOR ESTIMATE OF COST)

- Averaged \$4 per lunch.
- \$100 (2)
- Mileage — 150 miles, \$30.
- \$25-30.
- Mileage — 10 miles, lunch \$6.
- \$5 (3)
- Bought book at \$6; speaker autographed!
- Fee, luncheon and share of gasoline for local History Conference.
- Lunch \$12.
- Gas mileage Livonia to Ann Arbor and back. (I could have put in for mileage to Plymouth-Canton but it wasn't enough to bother with.)
- About \$100 plus Grand Rapids lodging, etc.
- Meals and lodging \$120.
- Not sure how much, but not a lot of dollars.
- Travel, meals, extra cost of conference.
- \$100 plus.
- Approximately \$20.

Did your school district pay the additional costs, did you, or did someone else?

- State Department of Education.
- School District paid for couple — I paid for other five.
- PEA paid some.
- School reimbursed for mileage.

QUESTION 8: You requested (READ SERVICES FROM FIRST PAGE). When you used these individualized services did you participate by yourself, with one or two others, or with more than two others? (RECORD NUMBER OF SERVICE FROM FIRST PAGE IN APPROPRIATE RESPONSE CATEGORY.)

- Went by self in car -- others from Livonia were there.
- Wrote for funding so numerous staff members could participate -- shared information/outcome from activities with NSDC.
- Participated with MRA group and four from this school.

QUESTION 9: Did you use in your classroom any of the ideas, techniques, materials or plans that you developed or acquired?

- Didn't have a classroom.
- Driver education for handicapped. Hard to recall specifics on sex education — difference between resource room vs. self-contained.
- Shared with staff - gifted. Shared with principals; everything you do you share. Also my own professional growth.

Did these ideas, techniques, materials, or plans make a difference in your attitude and/or behavior as a teacher?

(IF YES, PROBE FOR SPECIFIC DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDE/BEHAVIOR.)

- Developed a tutor program with older students as a result of workshop.
- I became more aware of individual differences, and group dynamics.
- Became more interested and involved -- more hopeful attitude for the future.
- Became aware of some ideas that I wasn't aware of before — neurological imprints something I used. It didn't work as well as I expected. But it was somewhat effective.
- I became more aware of individualizing my programs to the needs of the students. I became enthusiastic.

QUESTION 9: (Continued)

- Ed Pino's behavior workshop was excellent.
- Much more relaxed in classroom. Updated her skills. Last business course was in 1950's. New materials. Worked on textbook committee and text she wanted was selected. New materials for Special Education kids.
- Learned that what we do in the regular classroom with gifted kids is just as important as what we do with kids who are in programs. Therefore, I seek to identify those kids and help them (in regular classes.) Played a management game on how to motivate staff around a new idea — good experience.
- Planning sessions for activities for high school students — these resulted in activities that we had not done before and felt positive about doing these activities.
- Gifted committee member presented first to staff and then adapted ideas to the program. Can't help but use what you learn — also did inservice with parents.
- Believe in philosophy of Global Education to begin with but got different insights on presenting things — vastness of global education.
- It was primarily a "make and take" workshop, so it had to.
- Films, teaching techniques, different ways to cover technical topics in economics.
- Added confidence in dealing with a blind student in class. Helped her to know she could push her.
- Teaching ideas I incorporated — think poetry was included — used some of the materials.
- Positive — any new ideas we take back to classroom. New things to try — otherwise you get so stale. Learned how special education is going in Michigan — experts from the State were there — one session was interpretation of law. Enlarged my knowledge of the field I'm in.
- I was running out of ideas and I got some new ideas. Got a booklet with all the ideas presented by all participants.
- The Mini-Award Committee gave me an appreciation of Livonia's programs — made me feel more positive. Was delighted with teachers asking for awards — they were special "catalyst-type" — made me proud to be a teacher. They gave me an opportunity to get out of my building "rut." I use Madeline Hunter ideas I gained from MASCD meeting — also presented part to my staff.
- Workshops, conferences increase my knowledge in area of specialization. In writing science unit — it was used with gifted children.

QUESTION 9: (Continued)

- I thought at least trying to get together.
- Stress workshop — relaxation. Getting to root of what's bothering you.
- Gifted and Talented — set up building plan of action using Renzulli Triad. Delivered information to District Superintendent's Cabinet and then to school committee. Developed criteria for all grades 1-5. Inserviced building staff. Submitted for inclusion in district language arts student profile. This was delivered to all elementary principals. These are some examples of some of things I shared with staff resulting from these conferences. I never attended a conference that I didn't do something with building-wide.
- Re: Talented and Gifted. Propelled into action activities to use with gifted kids and in the classroom. This is where start was for position in current job.
- The editor changed attitude toward published material. The printed materials developed with child in mind. It changed the way each story is presented — focus on presentation has been changed.
- Specifically "Kids on the Block." A whole new outlook on Special Education kids regarding kids in the classroom and how to "handle" them.
- Public Relations — more an awareness of need for communication between parent and home. How much? When?
- Developed a nature trail. Enabled outdoor study — use of the woods.
- Yes, because it gives fresh ideas and chance to exchange ideas. I have heard about Magic Circle. Reaffirmed beliefs — ready to dig in again.
- Provided insights into processes and ideas for gifted and talented program.
- Came back with a new idea. Being away from university for 22 years, it's good . . . in dealing with handicapped kids.
- Giving you extra push sometimes to make and plan new ideas, motivate, get me going — plus getting new ideas.
- Enthusiasm, something new and exciting to show to kids — new things that they would not otherwise have known about.
- Easier to plan meaningful activities for such a wide range of abilities — better management of materials.
- Any conference you attend you pick up new ideas and techniques — discipline — professional growth.

QUESTION 9: (Continued)

- Shared with staff-principal — also for my own professional growth. Enhanced own knowledge toward job — got rid of spider webs — motivated me to do something.
- The Chisanbop: I tried to build Chisanbop into program until I was enlightened by the program. I learned that the Chisanbop wouldn't work.
- The Middle School Conference helped in our consolidation.
- Bill Martin's program affected me: 1) inspirational — have to be 100% every day. 2) methods — get language in there first. (Mastery in Reading Conference)
- Being new to kindergarten, used ideas, gave me ideas in individualizing.
- Stress workshop was for burnout — good information — caused interest.

Did these ideas, techniques, materials, or plans make a difference in your students' attitude and/or behavior?

(IF YES, PROBE FOR SPECIFIC DIFFERENCES IN STUDENTS' ATTITUDE/BEHAVIOR.)

- They reacted in a more positive manner.
- We came up with ideas which helped the children during the Harrison/Titus merger.
- Madeline Hunter techniques helped to make a difference.

QUESTION 9: (Continued)

- The four-day field trip was good for my gifted and talented. It helped them and myself develop a camaraderie.
- Students enjoyed learning more — began reading the newspapers — volunteered more often. The student behavior improved.
- Positive discipline techniques. Shot-in-arm; morale booster.
- Less listless — made it more interesting. (Developing IMC Math Activities)
- If students think you don't know what you're talking about, they won't respond. Kids are sharp — they know what you know. Was able to pull in new "economic jargon" not used in old texts.
- Can't really answer this.
- Took students on German weekend to a retreat site. Spoke and lived "German" for the weekend. Many students got over their hesitating to use the language.
- New ideas helped solve some problems of year before. (Gifted and Talented Conference)
- Hard to measure but cannot be sure it related to these techniques, etc. Positive evaluation of project regarding students' attitudinal changes. (Global Education Conference)
- They enjoyed games; it's a new approach to learning. (Interest Centers Seminar)
- Grades went up — teacher's attitude became more positive.
- Students ended up helping teacher.
- These things are hard to measure.
- Whenever teacher's attitude is positive, students are too — in a round-a-bout way.
- Every time I got ready for a conference, I would tell the kids something about what I was doing. They would "help" me get ready for a substitute; and because I felt "special to be working on a History project," they felt like special kids. It helped check for vocabulary level of children's book.
- Use of Smoking Presentation.
- Roger Taylor workshop showed ways to help all kids in classroom: gave other kids confidence.
- Now students reflect excitement to read a story! The storyteller gave so many ideas for working with kids. (Reading/Language Conference)
- Because students were more aware and their parents were more aware. Parents attitude changed. (Public Relations Workshop)

QUESTION 9: (Continued)

- They enjoy that kind of activity (developing a Nature Trail). It is motivating. They got to help put in the trail. Helped keep the woods looking nice.
- We had meeting of all school teachers with a reading consultant -- found that students are not comprehending -- we couldn't use teachers' manual as Bible. We have all reevaluated manuals.
- Some of the things I picked up fit their level of function and they were better able to understand material. (Council for Exceptional Children)
- Loved working with Make/Take It; good learning activities.
- Wanted to learn how to do those things (rug braiding, creative needlepoint, etc.). Knew the projects were new and they wanted to try them.
- Indirectly -- as I improve as a teacher and give my 100%, they (students) benefit.
- Indirectly -- I don't know what to say.

Did these ideas, techniques, materials, or plans make a difference in your students' achievement:

(IF YES, PROBE FOR SPECIFIC DIFFERENCES AND EVIDENCE, IF AVAILABLE, OF DIFFERENCES IN STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.)

- We started it so near the end of the year that I have to rely on my intuition, but I think it was successful.

QUESTION 9: (Continued)

- Grades were better.
- Mostly attitudinal changes.
- Writing became more specific.
- Learned to work together and to depend on each other.
- One student did improve measurably.
- Students had a better knowledge of economics. They improved definitely in English and Math. Economics tests showed marked improvement.
- Tried harder — work improved — improved P.R.
- Slower ones did better — with short attention span they could go on and do another lesson.
- Hard to answer. Taught only one year — nothing to measure against.
- Saw students get over barrier of using a language and they became active rather than passive with the language. One student became an exchange student after this experience. (German Language)
- Quality of work improved. More cooperation from kids.
- Kids were tested with control groups and project students did better. Talked to students recently who are out of school now and project had an impact on them.
- Being in Title I, it's difficult to say — we've matured and grown but if it's a result of the workshop, I don't know.
- Yes, because of skills in art.
- These were enrichment kind of things.
- They were terrifically good — department-wise on. Field trips to Livonia Hill House — they were so motivated and focused on a purpose.
- Listening skills workshop affected students' growth.
- Concrete evidence: Title I School M.E.A.P. — 78% of school's children achieved 75% or more of the objectives. 3/6 of students are laureate winners at the district level for creative writing.
- At times, for some students in resource room. It helped them do some of the things other students do (especially Social Studies), but at their own level. Those resource room students actually taught a class session.
- Informally — not able to check academically for specifics.
- Indirect — not measurable on specific tests.
- Unknown — achievement not able to be measured.
- We felt their reading comprehension was better. This is something the school has been putting effort into. (Math Text Comprehension Conference)

QUESTION 9: (Continued)

- Some exercises are stimulating -- kids enjoy them. (BCS Biology Conference)
- Only things I can say -- last year tested in beginning and at end of year -- they made gains. Handicapped kids don't make as many gains. General knowledge -- they pick up a lot -- in math and reading skills as well.
- Math -- self-checking -- or one-on-one manipulative activities.
- Could accomplish something that was not part of the regular program.
- Hard to measure; his (Bill Martin) methods and district methods are used.
- Helped them learn beginning sounds, telling time, counting, number configuration, readiness skills.
- Personal life.
- Presented to other districts -- places far greater emphasis now on what happens to kids in regular classes who are gifted. Now advocates this in presentations.

QUESTION 10: Did your use of individualized services have a benefit for other teachers, your school program, or the school district as a whole:

(PROBE FOR NATURE OF BENEFIT TO OTHERS AND PROCESS THROUGH WHICH SKILLS OR INFORMATION WERE SPREAD.)

- The merger (Titus/Harrison) program obviously impacted on the entire school.
- Greatly affected current Alternative Education program with new ideas -- ideas from other programs throughout the State.
- We successfully merged -- with the help of our committee. (Titus/Harrison merger)
- Work on mini-grant for English teachers.
- Other teachers were involved in the curriculum changes and teacher placement brought on by the middle school concept.
- Other teachers were subjected to all kinds of encounters. They enjoyed it and did many of the projects I had used. I spoke at two Consortium Days and people in the group asked additional questions.

QUESTION 10: (Continued)

- One of the teachers who participated in the weekend (German Language Department weekend retreat) felt he learned as much as the students because he had not taught German for some time himself and this helped him get back into it.
- Parent Helpers: Guidelines for working with children; learned about expectations motivation. Parents felt more at ease in the program after ideas were shared with them. School was used as a model so this was a benefit. (Gifted and Talented Conference)
- Wrote curriculum for program which other teachers used; program still exists and is disseminated throughout state with school district's name on it. Good public relations.
- Was a personal kind of thing.
- Shared with others.
- Informal sharing basis.
- At a parent meeting after school — resource room teachers presented materials I learned about at conference.
- If they were into creative writing projects as I am.
- Presented Madeline Hunter's ideas on use of blackboard to staff on curriculum day. The History packet will be presented to Language Arts representatives on October 14 and then one of us will go into buildings and present them to staff.
- ACAT teachers — full-time gifted. District-wide and other district workshops.
- Grant for program in English — revised the way comp was taught.
- Shared program from three-day University of Michigan CEEB with other teachers.
- Newsletter — I was liaison — helped form.
- Eventually Roger Taylor came to our school district as a result of participation in the workshop. Gifted/Talented was just getting off the ground. Roger Taylor was a good person to inspire us in the beginning — others able to carry on task as presenters and may be better.
- Other teachers may have been impractical through conversations.
- Talk on one-to-one basis with other teachers in the building.
- Public Relations workshop — made teachers aware — ongoing communication — home and school — especially in building.
- Developed handbook. Staff meeting updates. Use of new materials. It helped everybody.
- All teachers have tried to work harder on math comprehension skills.

QUESTION 10: (Continued)

- Came back from Grand Rapids with new techniques -- materials -- exhibit one of the largest in state. I'm going to miss it. Plymouth is not allowing any. I like to go every other year or so to see what's happening. (MEA/IPD Conference)
- Helped in development of a plan for Redford Union.
- We shared with other biology teachers what we experienced. Several hands-on activities are used in classroom. Reading level was pretty high for most of our kids. (BSCS Biology Workshop)
- In terms of sex education, our school is in formative stage -- through awareness of our shortcomings -- we met at this seminar -- we saw how others handled it. We worked toward a well-rounded program.
- Shared with other kindergarten teacher. Shared with first-grade teacher. By sharing with others; they went to other seminars.
- Make class more interesting -- get students to elect class because they saw what others were doing. Shared with other teachers and secretary -- showed them projects and they were interested in ideas personally.
- Science program used in school and adopted this year in district.
- Shared with principal, interested teachers, parents, etc. -- Stress Workshop -- Dennis Sparks presented.
- All that information was shared with colleagues and staff. Threw out ideas to challenge us. It provided us with insight into problems we sometimes ignore. We became aware that there are answers and techniques that are new -- or that we can delve into. It helps us to grow. The sharing of ideas most beneficial to me.
- I shared (talked with other people).
- Made other teachers aware of services available to them to use in the class. Made them less fearful of handling Reproductive Health in the classroom.
- Shared games and other ideas with teachers.
- Helped initially but school did not follow through. Most valuable part was getting to know other people from our own school.

QUESTION 11: Did your use of individualized services influence you to seek other NSDC services, such as workshops or Mini-Awards?

(IF YES, PROBE TO FIND OUT NATURE OF INFLUENCE.)

- Alternative Careers -- but already booked. Others tried and did go.

QUESTION 11: (Continued)

- I applied later for subs to attend Michigan Association for Educational Options Meeting.
- All are intertwined — it's difficult to say which came first.
- Obviously, I was at seven activities. (At least)
- I had two more experiences.
- Attending the Michigan Reading Convention in Grand Rapids led me to get involved in the Economics Workshop which led to the Mini-Society mini-grant. Having Nancy Allan demonstrate the badge-maker at our school orientation in September several years ago spurred my interests in badge-making.
- Mini-Awards.
- Continued to seek services in whatever way possible.
- Motivated to make application for other monies and told others about it.
- After this, always looked through newsletter — one workshop came during parent conferences — was scheduled to go.
- Applied for workshops after this service.
- When I made my games, I used NSDC materials, laminating, etc. I felt the workshops helped refresh me in techniques; "old hat" but I forgot them — learned new ones — went to motivational one — theory was enlightening — gave me new thoughts.
- Held a mini-workshop for our staff. Attended workshop in Plymouth.
- Made me aware other things are also available.
- Went to workshop — made materials. (Wayne County Materials Exhibit)
- Like potato chips — I devoured opportunities. Sure made a difference in my attitude at this stage of my life and number of years in education.
- I applied for every conference for myself and ACAT teachers. Attended affective schools. I knew it would be quality.
- Several mini-award contracts. 1) Kindergarten Seminars for Parents — 7 Seminars. 2) Laureate Award — School District Young Authors.
- The stress workshop at middle school helped us get our school staff to know each other better. We took advantage of these services to continue to plan and organize our district Tag program.
- It influenced my applying for a mini-grant which really helped develop curriculum in our building.

QUESTION 11: (Continued)

- Very definitely!
- Workshops -- yes, several. Did not get into mini-award projects however.
- It probably would have -- this just happened recently and now the Center is closed.
- We do not always have the privilege of going -- everyone is given opportunity to go to one -- but only to one.
- Not directly. With small children it's not convenient.
- Caused teacher to suggest topics for workshops -- one of which occurred.
- I was going to use them (services) but they phased it (NSDC) out. It seems to be a pattern with government.
- I did try to write a mini-award during 2nd semester. I made a two-pronged approach. It had merit, but they asked me to refine one or the other approach. Didn't have time to resubmit -- but did write up something with colleagues. It may have been too large.
- After first one, I took advantage of anything that pertained to my grade level. They were terrific.
- Always read about workshops but they were ones I couldn't use or had a time conflict with.
- Make/Take Workshop.
- After attending one workshop, you tended to want to attend others. Obviously the number I attended (7) reflects this. Also, attended workshops after school which aren't listed.
- Through NSDC we got interested in doing more things for district. It's hard to pinpoint. It's the sum total of all experiences that lead to us getting mini-grants. South Redford got their share of money by sharing answers and techniques that are new -- or that we can delve into -- it helps us grow. The sharing of ideas most beneficial to me.
- After I used the service, I started reading the newsletter to look for services.
- Hassle to get money back -- was part of reason didn't ask again.
- Was so satisfied with one -- pursued more.

QUESTION 12: NSDC has individualized staff development by allowing teachers to pursue their unique goals and interests. The use of "Request for Service" forms and Mini-Awards are two of the ways in which the Center has encouraged teachers to pursue their own goals and learn at their own rate. We would like to know if our attempts at individualizing your learning have had any effect on your efforts to individualize your learning for your students. Did the Center's modeling of an individualized staff development program reinforce your efforts to individualize with students, cause you to implement or expand individualized learning in your classroom, or did it have little or no effect on what you did?

(PROBE FOR NATURE OF EFFECT, IF ANY.)

- The tutoring program was very individualized for the students singled out.
- I've always individualized instruction (2)
- We already individualize with our gifted and talented.
- I teach Special Education. I've always individualized my planning.
- I have always attempted individualizing learning situations but I've done it more successfully since contact with NSDC.
- Have been aware of importance of individualizing with teachers and students.
- Certain students with low ability were reinforced -- this helped.
- Now in IMC -- of course things must be individualized.
- When you become more aware that others think like you do, it reinforces what you are doing. "Freedom" -- did provide teachers with freedom to choose.
- The opportunity to go on a weekend campout (German Retreat) put the teachers in closer touch with all the students who participated. Individualizing was rather indirect -- anything that lets you see kids outside of the classroom helps you individualize for them because you know them.
- Seek things to help a particular group in your room -- you're looking for things to work on with individual kids.
- Have tried to individualize and had that philosophy for years -- long before contact with NSDC.
- I think I teach far differently -- broadened out and now do more of an individualized approach rather than a group approach. A number of workshops helped me individualize it -- an idea here, another there, and combine them.

QUESTION 12: (Continued)

- Gave me another way of looking at how I teach reading — no new ideas any more — changing thoughts.
- "Been individualizing for years."
- I'm pretty individualized — I don't have a regular classroom.
- I took information from conference and let them use it.
- I don't think of NSDC being individualized — but it was an opportunity to participate or do something I liked doing. I would think of some student I had that year or some group, and try something I heard about — but I really didn't give them choices, just enrichment.
- Have no classroom, but it reaffirmed my dedication to individualize learning.
- Does not apply to nature of situation. Most was done as an awareness or with groups of staff members. (The method was not that specifically used by NSDC) Spin-off — incidental learning.
- Individualized instruction is always a part of management.
- I do not individualize children's learning. I mostly teach group instruction. Some small groups.
- The concept was one I was well aware of prior to going. The model was an effective one.
- I didn't think it had an impact on individualized learning.
- I haven't been able to select anything I like — I don't have the released time.
- My attempt at individualization always there. NSDC enhanced my own development strongly. NSDC really helped newer teachers. It was a very warm place to go — it made a big difference.
- Already had that approach.
- Reinforced philosophy I already have. I like to take kids where they are. I haven't used Center as much as I'd like to.
- Handling stress — teach involvement, better able to cope with day-to-day situations. Well done — we had an excellent speaker.
- Provided me with opportunity to make individual activities for children which then became more a part of individualizing for them. Of course, kindergarten is a little different than other classes.
- Classes are individualized to a great extent already. Did learn from the Center about techniques for group presentation which was helpful. Will present to a group of students and seeing how Center staff made group presentations was helpful.

QUESTION 12: (Continued)

- Changed me personally -- been hard-nosed -- I'm more sensitive to teachers' needs and requirements. Changed from being autocratic to democratic.
- It helped me to organize my handling of matters with staff. It helped me see the same organizational patterns here -- assessed needs -- as the Center did. A direct correlation.
- I already individualize!
- Do it anyway -- may have reinforced to a limited extent.
- With kindergarten everything is so -- we had a special time to have games -- parents came in -- it's hard to pinpoint.
- Teaching here is all individualized anyway.

QUESTION 13: Looking back at the quality of these services in general, would you say that you were very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with their quality?

- Very satisfied (except for funds not being available now)
- Alternative Careers was excellent and gave encouragement that there would be another job.
- Everything was of high professional level
- NSDC has done a very good job. Provided materials, update at conference and inservice.
- I think expertise, knowledge, concern exhibited by staff members was outstanding. Their help -- very commendable. I was extremely pleased with all levels, from planning to meeting needs of teachers.
- Terrific!
- Very disappointed that the one I was supposed to go to was cancelled.

QUESTION 14: During the past three years you specifically requested assistance from the Center to (IF NECESSARY, READ LIST OF SERVICES PROVIDED ON PAGE 1 TO TEACHER). Please recall in as much detail as possible the thought processes and decisions that caused you to request that specific activity (or activities) rather than something else you might have requested. (PROBE FOR WHY THEY ASKED FOR "MOTIVATION CONFERENCE" OR "TIME FOR PLANNING SCIENCE CURRICULUM" RATHER THAN SOMETHING ELSE.)

- The Titus/Harrison Merger Committee was proposed by my principal. The conference was from the Curriculum Council.
- They pertained exactly to the program I was involved in.
- My principal suggested that we'd need some help to plan the merger.
- Madeline Hunter work was initiated from NSDC workshops the previous summer. Consultant/Release Time resulted from awareness of testing program at U of M. Federal Teacher Conference and The 24-Hour Conference resulted from Policy Board involvement.
- I requested the services to learn more about my job.
- Mine were mostly related to my subject areas -- except the "Quality of Life" workshop -- that was union related.
- The activities I was involved with were areas I felt I needed education in. Conferences were timely -- so I requested them.
- Wanted better ways to identify gifted students and how to individualize for them. Need more insight into today's kids -- split families, unemployment, etc. Need better image.
- As Assistant Principal, looking for ways to help teachers with discipline.
- Principal stated it was available and through newsletter reinforced idea. Principal encouraged us to attend and Dennis Sparks influenced us to use the service.
- Been away from business courses since 1955 -- wished to become "current" -- see new materials to order and use with classes. Wasn't aware of what was available. Many valuable speakers from world of business could tell what to expect when students entered business world. Free materials.
- Sponsored by MAGTEC -- knew that many professionals in similar positions would be there -- meet others in same field and learn from them. Program seemed to be of special interest.
- Had specific activities that involved meeting with other teachers in and out of the building -- that was specifically what request was about.
- Were not satisfied with program of gifted year before and realized had to go outside to get fresh shot-in-arm and see how to improve. Heard about Renzulli and decided to go to that program. It was close, a one-day (not overnight) program.

QUESTION 14: (Continued)

- Ones requested answered a felt need. Others were not necessarily meeting felt needs although they may have been good programs. Caliber of programs is excellent— that is why they were chosen.
- From the brochure and thing being offered, and the time of the year, it just seemed a good time to be refreshed — Spring cleaning "clears out the cobwebs."
- Intense interest in economics — looking for better ways.
- Frustration in classroom trying to reach a blind student. No help available locally — teacher of visually impaired suggested the school in Lansing.
- Interest in subject matter.
- Thought it was applicable to my situation — something I could use in my class at the time.
- Just told my principal I wanted to go — decided we'd get the funds through this means.
- Because it's concerned with my specialty. (Resource Room)
- Another teacher told me how marvelous the presenter of the workshop was. (Reading and Language Arts Conference)
- Was way for classroom teacher to get released time to work on committee (mini-award) — everyone else was "special" teacher or administrator of a program and didn't have self-contained classroom.
- My principal wanted someone from building to go (MASCD Conference) — I just asked for reimbursement of fee.
- Request for supplies (Livonia Hill House project) came as an outgrowth of a trip to a Humanities-Grant Workshop from Michigan State. It provided the way to get something done that we (Historical Society Education Committee) thought necessary to get done.
- It reflected our needs and conferences were there.
- Mini-Award — liked idea of giving money to teachers who had initiative — seemed to be one of few ways to recognize initiative and outstanding teachers.
- Was asked to serve and then, as Special Teacher, it didn't work out (Staff Development Council Inservice). Felt I had too little contact with teachers.
- Sounded like something that was enjoyable and wanted to be involved in.
- They all reflect goals that are established that relate to the needs for staff development in this building and/or current issues on the district level.

QUESTION 14: (Continued)

- 
- Always felt that reading is at the core of what we do. This Saturday conference (Reading and Language Arts) was initiated by the learning specialist. I was happy to have dollars refunded.
 - Things to use for concrete learning experiences within my grade level.
 - Public Relations Workshop — Heavily committed to get into administration. The concepts were good for teachers as well as administrators. Roger Taylor Workshop — To become acquainted with talented/gifted concepts — (just to listen to him).
 - We didn't have resources available — no funding available. Principal suggested pursuing funding NSDC because product was the outcome.
 - I had great interest in reading. When reading consultant mentioned it, I took advantage of opportunity. Several of us took it together. (MRA Text Comprehension Conference)
 - It made a difference whether I could go or not. Anything I requested — it made the difference if I could go. I could pick up conference fee, but not sub. There was more commitment on part of former principal. Now it's a lost cause until we get through economic crunch.
 - District need in talented/gifted and existence of district-wide committee.
 - It's a matter of finding money — a financial matter. The school couldn't afford day off so they recommended NSDC.
 - I felt need for updating — new material and program. Our school doesn't have available resources. An avenue there to accomplish that goal.
 - Felt a need to be exposed to new ideas. Great opportunity to benefit from others. Tried to develop math and reading centers in the room.
 - Interested in needle arts and crafts personally and teach these in regular program — always looking for new ideas and ways of presentation. New program (smocking) came out of these workshops.
 - My interest was aroused and through specific requests to NSDC, I was encouraged to follow through to completion of the things that interested me.
 - Science — no science curriculum for years, so used NSDC. MASCD — previous good experiences with conferences. Critical Thinking — hadn't thoughtfully tried to answer thinking questions — just recall of facts.
 - Knew that the District wouldn't provide notepaper and felt that it was a neater way of communicating with other counselors by something other than white paper. Thought process: Had to figure out another way to defray costs if the District wasn't going to provide the funds.

QUESTION 14: (Continued)

- Lots of reasons. South Redford is seeking ideas in implementation of gifted/talented program. It helped me attain everything in gifted/talented. Attended a Roger Taylor workshop paid for by NSDC. Clinical Supervision - new evaluation form. I was part of implementation committee. I wanted to hear more about clinical supervision. Effective Discipline - some teachers had problems - workshop helped. All conferences/workshops tended to be learning processes.
- I needed what the service (NSDC Math Workshop) offered. It filled a need.
- I needed it to be certified in Reproductive Health.
- Teaching first grade for the first time, and I needed to know more about teaching reading. Like different ideas - this was meeting a need.
- The fact that I was placed in kindergarten and did not have background - looked for anything that would help in that respect.
- Selected for us by administration - it was enjoyable.

QUESTION 15: What do you consider to be the strengths of this process? (PROBE.)

- A little direction from administration is a good thing.
- The things I involved myself in fulfilled my needs.
- Teacher involvement - makes the teacher feel more of a professional.
- My interests apply to me and my students.
- Well, I like to select things that are applicable to my particular needs.
- There seems to be "something for everyone" - if you couldn't find a program to help you - you could help develop one. NSDC was always helpful and encouraging.
- Ease of filling out requests.
- More opportunities - no need to get a group together to learn. Less complicated - fewer strings attached.
- Pick things that match your strengths and weaknesses. Can pick things that meet your need.

QUESTION 15: (Continued)

- The fact that it is individualized — not like Consortium Days. It better meets your own needs.
- Permits those who are seeking to gain expertise to look around and find something that will be most productive for them.
- If you want to plan a project, you have the means and time to do it; especially if it means dealing with other people. People have commitments after school which makes it necessary to get release time for something like this. Gives you opportunity to sit down and accomplish something.
- Something is not being shoved down throat. There is not same, repetitive stuff over and over. New people with wide range of ideas through NSDC.
- Allows people to go someplace or get a service who may not be "chosen" or who might otherwise be overlooked. Frequently, "certain" persons are always allowed to go. Allows people to show the interest that they do have to peer group, administration, etc.
- Gives an individual a chance to choose and strengthen area in which you have a real need.
- If I'm more interested, I'm more apt to learn from the workshop.
- Sharing ideas.
- It is there when local resources come up short, are unavailable.
- Different ideas, comments, etc., from outside resources other than the same personnel in our own district.
- Just does what it's trying to do — meeting individual needs.
- Gives teacher means to attend — requested a workshop through school and found it was granted two days after the registration was supposed to be — more organized than school district for granting requests.
- I think teacher involvement — when you make commitment yourself it's much more effective — there's a bit of hostility if something is imposed upon you, e.g., inservice.
- I grow professionally.
- It worked! I got to do what I wanted, or what my principal wanted me to do, and gave me a "participatory" feeling.
- The individual — you could fit it to what your needs were at the time. Less bureaucracy.
- Recognition of initiative. Go out of building to another source. Judged by peers, not by administrators. Broadens recipient's experiences and clarifies their thinking.
- Good I can select. I wish there were more selections. (Consortium Day)

QUESTION 15: (Continued)

- Too often inservice is unimportant because of wide variety of teacher interests — this way you can choose what's important.
- Pursue individual needs, interests at a time when you are needing them. It's a fantastic resource pool — dollars, experts, materials to implement and inform the recipient. Resources of seven school districts are available.
- Just as with children gearing interests — teachers benefit from choices to pursue interests.
- People who are interested in what they are doing will choose what specifics they want and will do more than just attend a general conference.
- To be able to choose what you will use.
- You can develop an area you need to — either weakness or strength area. Allowing people to choose own areas rather than all going to one. Appreciative of fact they didn't limit. Appropriate to involvement. Positive feedback to help you as a teacher.
- The fact that it's available without my going cross-country.
- Appreciated newsletter. Allowed teachers to get to know each other in a new way. Builds motivation. Tremendous potential for spin-off of new ideas — this is especially important.
- I think there's more. If we have right to choose we'll have more involvement and get more from it. If dictated, you must go, but don't get back as much from it. Came back from NSDC feeling a lot better about conference and ready to implement what I've learned.
- Able to think through areas that you, yourself, are weak in. Then you can strengthen those areas.
- Couldn't ordinarily go to these daytime programs — substitute being provided was excellent — didn't have to burden the school district by asking for a substitute.
- It allowed me to seek out what interested me, without "red tape."
- Causes teacher to stand back and think about needs — awakens latent talents.
- Success of request being granted led to application for more services.
- Because you take your own needs assessment, you become knowledgeable of your specialized needs and you can concentrate on those conferences and workshops that can enhance them. As principal I want as many ideas as possible to help staff. It's a knowledgeable and mature staff. It (a mature staff) can be stagnant. You have to bring new ideas — pizzazz — to get them going. I need something to pick myself up — and hope to be a catalyst. Even for one person it's worth it.

QUESTION 15: (Continued)

- It's individualized -- meets needs.
- I like directing (selecting) my own course.
- If a teacher can recognize weaknesses and then have choices; he/she can improve. Helps person's attitude and you feel you're growing -- need to be constantly inspired and need contacts with outside world.
- Could ask for what you need.
- Well organized -- excellent people conducting it.

QUESTION 16: What do you consider to be the weakness of this process? (Probe.)

- The principal let everyone know of the services but not everyone used them.
- Everyone's needs would have to be met. There would have to be only very general programs.
- Everyone can go off in a variety of directions. We often lack follow-up in the building so that the skills get lost before we can apply them.
- I don't see any.
- Some teachers need direction or they would choose wrong workshops, etc. They might not wisely select.
- None -- I'm sorry too few people took advantage.
- Getting reimbursed.
- Filling in forms and lag time.
- Might pick something easy -- that doesn't require a lot of work. You may not select something that you are weak in and really should do.
- Consortium Day was too generalized and often times didn't meet the immediate needs.
- People may lack the initiative to initiate the process even if they know it's there.

QUESTION 16: (Continued)

- Assuming that person will do what he/she says will do. Could be a weakness but we hope we're dealing with professional people. How far do you want to go to monitor the actual use.
- For some people -- they'll only go to same things time after time instead of expanding their outlook.
- Might be threatening to some people to have the administrator approve the form. May not want administration to know you're interested in something.
- I wish they'd have one in Hawaii -- send me!
- Quality of staff at NSDC affects quality of program.
- None in process but teachers who are overburdened cannot take advantage even though they want to.
- Can't think of any -- except loss of NSDC.
- Not all people would actually go ahead and apply for it.
- No idea -- can't see any -- those who are interested will do it-- if if were given to others who did not request it, they probably wouldn't use it as well.
- Doesn't include more passive people.
- That's a hard one: 1) The blurb that I get promises something, but does not deliver. 2) Not fault of NSDC -- the scheduling of the conferences (dates) and location -- the airport and Eastern aren't bad.
- Perhaps some of us got more than our share of the largesse -- but I felt I've made excellent use of the time and money.
- None.
- Built-in prejudices -- pretty good system -- always pressed for time.
- Not enough for special teachers (Consortium Day Program).
- No funding.
- The location of the Northwest Staff Development Center.
- The quality of the workshop is not previewed. The time spent going is a gamble.
- Administrators may have difficulty in monitoring.
- I don't see any.
- So many choices. Couldn't look into depth regarding activities. Checking system weak.
- Teachers can't often make up their minds and need direction.
- The time. The teacher doesn't have the time and the problem of substitutes. Even though substitute may be paid; it's still a probable absence from the classroom.

QUESTION 16: (Continued)

- Can't think of any.
- Apathetic clientele will not do anything — support and encouragement closer to the teacher than the Center is.
- It could be that some people might misuse.
- Some people were limited in what they got involved in. Some didn't attempt to get involved. It was there if you wanted to seek it — a way to do it. Forms not lengthy — not long drawn-out effort to apply — fairly simple to go.
- Don't see any weakness. Must always use what you get.
- Minor trouble — filling out a form — but that goes along with any service.
- I don't see weaknesses — except that some people need a group to be motivated.
- The forms that needed to be filled out — evaluation forms, etc.
- If it's a volunteer program, you have to depend on person to do own needs. You have to urge, etc. but it's really up to them.
- I don't see any among professional staff.
- Some people are not aware of what one can get.
- None — teachers know what they need and what's good for them.
- None.
- Maybe too long but would be difficult to change.

QUESTION 17: You probably know some teachers who did not request any individualized services from the Center in the past three years. Why do you think it is that some people reach out for this type of assistance while others do not? (PROBE FOR INITIAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN "USERS" AND "NON-USERS.")

- Too busy — don't take time.
- Some people are not interested enough to give up their time. They don't keep up with what's offered.
- Some feel more a need for it.
- Some are so depressed by their perceived failure of the school system that they feel any effort is useless. Some "protect" themselves by withdrawing into the classroom and closing the door. Some are too lazy. Some use life outside of school to provide satisfaction, challenge, stimulation.

QUESTION 17: (Continued)

- Most have been stereotyped in their job. One lesson for 15 years.
- Some people are lazy — or self-centered — no creativity. Some individuals have a difficult time with substitutes. Some don't feel that they need it. Some feel (bad attitude) that it is a bunch of "bull."
- There are "doers" and those who "don't." Lethargy — some people don't want to get involved in anything that might ask something back from them. Certainly not because of lack of information in my school.
- Perhaps too time consuming to fill out forms. Don't read mail. Too comfortable where they are. Don't know how it would help them.
- Lack of creativity and imagination. Being in a rut. Lack of stimulation and new ideas.
- Some more motivated — some burned-out; don't want. Time element also. Anything new. Some long-time teachers don't seek to improve themselves or don't think they need it.
- Some people have been teaching in their areas so long — they feel secure — not willing to change.
- Those who create change and those who react. Those who took advantage of the service are those who initiate change. Others are those who do not initiate change.
- Difficult to answer — sometimes things can be accomplished without using the service.
- Some are only interested in teaching and putting in their time. May complain but don't do anything about it.
- Feel smug and secure and don't have to do anything — I did this 20 years ago. More work to go — get sub plans, etc. and wonder if it's worth it. Helpful because otherwise couldn't afford to go.
- Need to know they are available — some staff members were unaware. Have to be interested in upgrading your personal teaching — that's the whole ball of wax.
- Fatigue — burn-out.
- Some are more dedicated than others — some like the challenge of new ideas while others are content with routine. Pink-slipping makes a great difference!
- That's a complex issue. You get so involved on a day-to-day basis. I don't teach as well as I know how to already. So busy — to reach out to get new ideas.
- Some people are happy with "status quo" and not interested in change — "I have enough to do — I don't need any more ideas."

QUESTION 17: (Continued)

- Difference in personality -- "peer pressure" in school leads others to use service.
- Lack of communication -- NSDC would send out flyer -- or notice thumb-tacked on board -- our schedule does not allow us to pursue the posting.
- Non-users want only minimum involvement professionally for paycheck; others are too busy at their particular period of life with spouse and children or other interests.
- Inertia -- discouragement with profession ("I'll be pink-slipped anyway.")
- Ignorance is one reason -- may be too good to be true. I could never figure out why some people didn't use it.
- Some are more professional. Non-professionals just want to get through the day. Others have so many problems they use their energy just getting through the day.
- Some are working to collect paychecks, not to teach. Many who didn't use services were not informed of opportunities. Communications could have been simpler.
- It's the individual differences of teachers. Some do and some don't.
- I didn't at first because I thought it was too complicated to fill out the forms, "more trouble than it was worth." Once you do it, you realize it's an easy and smooth-flowing process.
- Probably teachers who are established in methodology -- would not want to be bothered.
- Awareness. Some picked up on it faster than others. High usage. Prioritize -- NSDC was necessary. Indifference to anything outside school day. Once people went they felt more comfortable.
- People who don't probably aren't that knowledgeable about what the Center has to offer.
- Time -- some teachers have more time. We have teachers working on courses. Teachers with families -- they don't have the extra time.
- Level of participation depends on building administrator. Some much more aware and supportive than others. There is a segment of teachers who are resistant to change. They viewed NSDC as change and resisted it. People I know personally are very closed, not changing.
- Users are most imaginative and creative -- more growth oriented. Attitude of administrators -- imagination and creativity of principals.

QUESTION 17: (Continued)

- I think it's that some people are innovative and want to grow and some sit and stagnate. I hope it's not too harsh. Some people don't do anything.
- Maybe some are set in ways -- I would think some people are more concerned about doing a good job. Public expects accountability. It's their loss not to better themselves professionally. It's easy to fall into a rut. Important for middle-aged teachers to look around for new ideas.
- Some people are satisfied with status quo and not interested in working any harder. Does take effort to carry on after workshop and some would not be bothered.
- May not have been aware of how to use service -- may not have had program in their area -- may lack initiative. Teacher who had attended workshop would tell others about services and encourage them to look into it -- but they usually didn't.
- From what I know, the "non-users" were simply too lazy or turned off and/or out by the administration to make application.
- People secure in rut and don't want to risk moving out of it. Distance to travel for some people who live far away (Howell, Brighton, etc.)
- Some people are satisfied with status quo -- we need encouragement or motivation in our jobs.
- Maybe they are not aware of services.
- They might not know about the forms -- red tape, etc.
- Sometimes limited in how many people could go -- limitations put on teachers rather than that they aren't interested.
- Some are interested in broadening experiences and others do not care.
- I don't know -- helpful to me but others might be inconvenienced. Some look for something -- others don't.

QUESTION 18: We'd like to better understand the principal's role in this process. Did he or she encourage teachers to use this service, make the "Request for Service" forms easily accessible, suggest specific activities to teachers, little involvement (approved request), or no involvement? (PROBE "ENCOURAGED TEACHERS".)

- Very involved in the merger (Titus/Harrison)
- He was involved directly.

QUESTION 18: (Continued)

- Searched out activities and suggested them.
- Made us aware of programs and encouraged us to request aid, etc.
- Encouraged teachers very much - got me to go to IMC Math Activities workshop.
- Principal needed to find details for herself - requested form from NSDC.
- Department keenly aware of the service - by Director of Curriculum; presented at staff meetings.
- Principal wasn't really involved with this request.
- Didn't necessarily bring it up but when I found something; he was supportive. Particularly supports gifted activities.
- One principal said, "Get forms from secretary," when asked asked about forms. Initiative was from teacher. Doesn't think principal pushed services at staff meetings, etc.
- Don't remember principal ever mentioning it.
- Suggested specific activities to teachers (one known example).
- When I went to him, he was positive.
- After he knew of (and encouraged) my involvement, he would suggest that I involve staff in some projects - to improve morale or solve a particular problem, but not much response from staff.
- Reminded us that this was available.
- First year - tapered off later.
- Some building principals more supportive than others.
- Little involvement - the learning specialist mentioned many of the coming activities.
- He announced ones (activities).
- One principal, yes - she helped. The other principal didn't even know where forms were.
- Never personally pushed me to anything. Elaine (Policy Board Member) was the spearhead. He may have depended on her.
- Being in Special Education, I have two administrators. Principal did mention in staff meetings - I must say forms were readily available.
- Had the forms - workshops I attended did not come as result of principal.
- Personally, she ran off own copies of forms and gave to others to make easier for self; didn't know who had forms. Principal was cooperative and helpful and did not hinder process at all.

QUESTION 18: (Continued)

- Supervisor thought it was a great thing.
- Anything I (administrator) could get them to do -- I'd push them out the door.
- Mentioned at meetings -- made them aware -- made it possible.
- Received flyers only.

QUESTION 19: We'd like to know how you keep yourself learning and growing professionally. Do you receive stimulation and/or modeling from colleagues, read professional journals or books, attend workshops, take graduate courses, go to annual conventions or professional organizations, write articles, make presentations at conferences, serve on committees and boards, or other activities? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.)

- Some are so bad (graduate courses).
- I've been at six different schools -- gotta stay on toes.
- I'm active in piloting new texts -- active on school climate committee -- share interests on Consortium Days -- very active in community affairs.
- Request mini-grants.
- Keeping an open mind -- reserving my judgment.
- Television -- Channels 56 and 62 have conferences, etc.
- Reading is most important.
- Travel.
- Conventions of professional organizations -- when possible.
- Pursue own art development to maintain enthusiasm about own art work.
- When you make one presentation I don't think you make much growth. Being involved as a curriculum representative.
- State Department of Education Committees -- State Department of Education Handbook (I co-wrote).
- Inservice.
- Change of assignment -- grade level.
- Seminars. Writing a book!!!
- Handbooks for district use. Made a slide presentation and presented the information -- TAG -- in the district (The Needs of the Gifted Child).
- Committee work - curriculum.

QUESTION 19: (Continued)

- In process of co-authoring instructional materials -- in district.
- We are setting up new professional committees -- I'm working on that.
- Used to attend conventions of professional organizations until six years ago.
- I'm in Special Education and I'm partly responsible for coordinators to form association. They have monthly meetings. Sit on Planning Commission and Township Board. Special Olympics. On City Council. Run a work experience program in business.
- Classes that are not graduate level but relate to teaching such as crafts, etc.
- Will be starting graduate courses. Often don't have time -- tight schedule.

QUESTION 20: How involved would you say you have been in the activities of your Education Association? Would you say you are very involved, somewhat involved, or not very involved at all?

• (PROBE FOR NATURE OF INVOLVEMENT.)

- Building Representative. (10)
- Member of Governing Board for eight years. Served on various committees.
- Community work.
- Secretary of Union. Chairperson three times of various committees.
- First Chief Negotiator of Administrative Union.
- Dues paying member.
- On Retirement Committee -- was on Report Card Committee (Co-Chairman) was on Merit Pay Committee.
- Have been representative for several years -- when callers are needed for phone campaign or miscellaneous work, I volunteer.
- Building Representative 5 out of 11 years.
- Staff Advisory Council.
- Used to be very involved -- was rep -- area director for a while.

QUESTION 20: (Continued)

- Very involved but only in past. Was on Board of Directors; on Bill Harn campaign for President; SCOPE; RA Rep.
- LEA Representative — NEA Delegate — MEA Delegate. In other states very active — was active early in LEA, MEA, NEA. Felt the "group" wanted to do things "their way" and I would get politically involved to survive and effect something — didn't like the Union attitude.
- Building Chairperson, three years. On sub-committee.
- "I didn't have time." If asked, I did it — but didn't volunteer.
- Administrators' Conference. Negotiating Team.
- Representative — also on cabinet.
- Lately I haven't been involved as much since the new Wayne County Union. Until then I was a representative. I ran elections.
- Have been a building representative and served on various committees.
- Human Relations Chairman.
- Helping with telephone calls in elections.

QUESTION 21: We'd like to know more about professional involvement you have outside your classroom. For example, some teachers serve on curriculum committees, are officers in professional organizations, or are members of community advisory boards related to education. Would you say that you have been very involved, somewhat involved, or not very involved at all in these types of things.

(PROBE FOR NATURE OF INVOLVEMENT, e.g., CURRICULUM COMMITTEES, ELECTED OFFICER, ETC.)

- PTA — Curriculum Council.
- Booster Clubs — PTA.
- Local Curriculum Committees.
- Garden City Total Consolidation Committee (merging high schools, etc.) — Special Liaison to Athletics — Curriculum Development Committees and many more.
- Curriculum Committees — MACLD — PTA Events — Workshops — Mini-Workshops — Inservice.
- School Climate Committee — Talented and Gifted Committee — Textbook Piloting Programs — Life Member of NEA — Grade Level Chairman — active in PTA.

QUESTION 21: (Continued)

- Piloted texts; served on curriculum committees.
- Book Selection Committee.
- Department Chairman — member of Building Faculty Council (curriculum for building) — participated in at least a dozen proposal writing grants (federal and state) — member of systemwide K-12 Curriculum Committee.
- Curriculum/Math-Science Representative — Textbook Committee — Teacher/PTA Vice-President.
- Wrote system objectives, criterion referenced texts, curriculum.
— Professional Sorority.
- Curriculum Committee. (8)
- District-Wide Health Committee — Health for the 80's.
- Any time they want someone to do something, they ask you to do it and you can't say "no."
- Human growth summer thing — math, language arts.
- I only feel I'm somewhat involved but in relation to "average classroom teacher" I'm pretty involved. I've been on the LATE committee (student teachers) and attended state, regional, and national conventions and meetings (will there be student teachers again before I retire!?). Been on every math text selection committee in every state I've taught in — helped write the Montana State math curriculum early in my career — involved myself in politics in Utah to help the teachers there — been president of Historical Society, and started a Friends of the Library group here — taught catechism class — also summer school (for migrating workers' children in Utah too) as a professional teacher — introduced Campfire Girls to state of Montana!
- League of Women Voters — work on millage. Work through community.
- Chairperson/writing of district reading guide — District Talented and Gifted Committee — Chairperson/Laureate Committee — Representative/MEAP — landmarked a park in Plymouth — large contributor/resource to school district's learning specialists.
- Worked on district TAG curriculum during summer.
- District Committee for Special Education Conference and Building Level Staff Development. Several building committees regarding curriculum.
- Several district committees — you only learn if you are involved!
- Participated on social studies committee — wrote curriculum for district and pursued adoption for three choices of curriculum — participated on TAG curriculum committee — hasn't yet been published but it will be.

QUESTION 21: (Continued)

- Teacher vice-president to PTO -- strong union member -- sat on Curriculum Coordinator Council -- had part in Plymouth-Canton curriculum (chose texts, etc.) -- sat on language arts curriculum -- volunteer at my daughter's school -- I have presented at reading councils, etc. -- I'm a member of decision-making advisory council at building level -- volunteered services to Plymouth-Canton reading program for parents and teachers.
- Pilot study of evaluation strategies for NDI -- state-wide committees -- pre-primary referent groups -- member of various national organizations -- serve on Board of non-profit organization -- co-chairman of MASCD Drive-In Conference.
- Past president, Rotary Club -- City Council -- Special Olympics Committee (took a lot of time) -- Planning Commission and Township Board -- writing memos, etc.
- "Dean" of principals.
- Professional organizations outside of school -- Delta Kappa Gamma.
- Council for Gifted -- Advisory for Gifted -- Title IX -- involved in Michigan Association for Administrative Women.
- School Board Policy Committee.
- Building Council -- North Central Evaluation Committee.
- Superintendent's Advisory -- State Board of CEC.

QUESTION 22: We'd like to know more about the extent to which you believe you have control over your own learning and professional development. Would you say that you have a great deal of control, some control, or little or no control? (PROBE.)

- Enough control -- time is a problem.
- I'm free to do what I want on my own time. The school doesn't encourage me to do much on their time. They don't keep us up to date on what's going on.
- Around here we are limited -- you are placed -- you are not allowed to choose.
- Nobody dictates to me.
- I decide what is to be taught and how to accomplish the tasks. Texts that we have are tools and may be supplemented by anything I care to use -- results are what is expected.
- Nobody tells me what to do -- I devise my own programs.
- Basic philosophy -- life is what you make it. There are many resources -- books, organizations.

QUESTION 22: (Continued)

- Limited by building, by colleagues, by lack of team effort. Change — everyone is being changed so often. Environment limits you — new building, new staff — hard to get together with new people.
- Job-wise you never know where you'll be. Jobs bounce back and forth — you improve to the top of your ability in the area you're in. Professionally do the best that you can — don't make any long-range goals. It's difficult to become very active in an organization in a field you might not be in next year.
- Twice in my life I have created experimental grants for electronics curriculum — teachers have taken it upon themselves to learn the subject even though certification is not required.
- When I really want to do something or take a class, etc., I'll just make a point of going regardless of how busy I am. I make it a point to go.
- Going to school now.
- I pick and choose the kind of things I want to know about; I read articles about new theories, specials on TV, attend workshops with colleagues.
- Can choose for self.
- Why wouldn't I — I'm responsible for myself.
- Attitude right now — ITIP will be all prevalent. Mainstreaming has made a change in activities in classroom. I teach a lot through simulation games. With extremely low students, find it difficult to find materials they can function at.
- I'm a determiner of my own faith.
- That's quite a question — it's my choice as to where I get materials, what I do with them; how I use them.
- I feel I have little control with the teacher situation and my age and my lack of advanced degree (although I have 100+ hours of graduate credit beyond my degree!).
- I've never felt that anyone was controlling it.
- Totally responsible because district doesn't have broad program.
- Own education — so many requirements set in graduate courses, certification, etc. NSDC could be accrediting organization — makes more sense.
- I have almost total control — time is the only constraint!
- They are my decisions.
- Yes, all!
- What you put into it you get out of it. Respect from peers is what you earn. Can expand on our own.

QUESTION 22: (Continued)

- The choice is yours -- opportunities are there. It is up to the individual.
- I knocked off masters in less than two years while working as a full-time teacher.
- I said "some." Professional development is partly restrictive by my family, by finance and then we are in an age of mentality that administration at board level may decide what we need and they feed it to us in two-hour seminars and think that takes care of problem. The only decent inservice came when NSDC surveyed us and then found the people to teach it.
- Focus of control is with me and how I use my time is mostly under my control; if priority, I make time for it. Have established job to have flexibility.
- I can determine whether to further my education.
- Have certain amount of control. I have a lot of additional responsibility. This doesn't leave me a lot of time to do other things. My time committed limits me from going to school (college), etc.
- It is up to me -- do I want to read, learn about current trends, look for workshops. It's up to my own thought processes. I can follow through also.
- How can anyone feel they have no control? I'm interested in everything I do -- not because of anyone else.
- If I want to do something I go to right supervisor and it gets done. Keep myself informed.
- If things are going to happen one has to see to it that they get done. Nobody is forced to attend meetings or be on committees.
- I can do about anything I wish to do about my own professional growth. Through district I can attend workshops, attend classes, etc. I can do as much as I want or as little as I want. My district has encouraged a great deal of learning. Even though we don't always have funds, we always encourage everyone to do what they can in professional growth. Can take a leave of absence to try another occupation and come back.
- Three different jobs in three years -- all by choice.
- I can do exactly what I want -- they give me leeway. They don't get upset about guest speakers. They believe I can handle it.
- Choose from what's offered.

QUESTION 23: In reference to teaching and your students, would you say that your learning makes a great deal of difference, some difference, or little or no difference? (Probe.)

- I think so!
- My learning makes me a better person — the kids benefit from that.
- The more insight and updated materials, the better job I do.
- I think if you stop learning, your enthusiasm will deteriorate. So will your students. I'm not through learning — continually changing my approach — trying new things.
- I am a fresher and more stimulating teacher — I keep up to the present times and am aware of many new theories and techniques. Also, I can read the results of research.
- Glasser seminars are one example. Influences are often subtle.
- New ideas, enthusiasm — whenever you learn, your enthusiasm carries over.
- Your own personal confidence helps you to do a good job.
- Use own experiences as a model — know how I learned and shared that with students. Teachers have to keep up on their own — this helps the students. Convey to students "how does one learn." I pass a great deal to them based on what I've learned. True in experimentation and problem solving.
- Anytime I go to Germany, take students somewhere, adds depth to the class.
- Learn ways to motivate kids; when I took a different class in stained glass, I realized the difference some kids have in their learning.
- If I'm taking computer class and can start kids to thinking about this — makes a difference to them. Workshop at Albion (current events) had different perspective on things and brought this back to juniors and seniors in high school.
- More I know, more I can teach. More techniques I know, the better I can disperse knowledge and plan the learning processes of my students.
- Knowledge to pass on — terminology changes.
- Own art experience is transmitted. Knowledge about psychology relates directly to classroom.
- What I know is what I teach.
- All the new things I learn.
- If I'm an illiterate dumbbell, I have nothing to offer them.

QUESTION 23: (Continued)

- It gives me a confidence that what I am doing is generally "right" for the individual child — and my years of experience have given me successful techniques to deal with some re-occurring situations.
- The more knowledge I have in field — the more I can give to kids.
- Brings new ideas. My teaching has become more humanistic, more individualized.
- A lot! With TAG students, many ways have to be learned to challenge them. Sometimes have to be more aware of their needs, i.e., The Structure of the Intellect, Bloom's Taxonomy, etc.
- I always seem to find something to bring back and share with students. Usually they are lasting.
- The attitude you purvey reflects on your students.
- Use a lot of information that is learned but that doesn't necessarily mean the student learns all because of the nature of children's learning.
- I don't think a day goes by that you aren't giving it in some way to students. Not a day goes by that I don't learn. Learning is a growth process.
- The more expert you become at learning about children and needs, the better you are at providing a program. Anything that stimulates me, I want to take it back and use in the classroom. I'm a much different teacher now than 10 years ago. In 10 more years I will be a different teacher also — as my children change. Any teacher who hasn't changed in 20 years is static. Not to jump on every bandwagon — but take best of changes.
- Project is nationally validated (NDN) because of her efforts. 115 adopted nationally.
- As you learn your enthusiasm is revived and it carries over into classroom.
- I think the involvement in special olympics gives special perspective to them for 3-4 days at a time. They get a different perspective of you. They develop a better understanding of one another.
- If I had not been learning and getting new ideas, children would not have had benefit of new things that are happening in kindergarten programs.
- Graduate classes have had little effect but craft classes and practical type classes make a great deal of difference.
- Can read or think about things and actually implement them.
- Ideas gained are used to the benefit of students.

QUESTION 23: (Continued)

- When I'm aware of what's going on in education, I can do more in my job. I don't feel stagnant, I don't feel the stress that some of my colleagues have.
- Keeps you current — keeps your enthusiasm — the interpersonal relationships help you avoid stagnation.
- The more I know the more I can pass on. I deal with the family-skills. I can make happy families.
- After this many years, additional learning will help somewhat but the quality is there already, I hope.
- Having a new room, I take a lot of courses in reading. I'm current and know what I'm doing.
- Nature of students defies training either undergraduate or graduate — has helped to organize.

QUESTION 24: There is a great deal of speculation these days about whether teaching is a profession. A "profession" is often defined as a body of knowledge and skills possessed by the practitioner that is not generally known by everyone. Would you say that teaching is a profession? (PROBE.)

- Your education separates you from the lay people. Your preparation, etc. The salary is generally commensurate with professionalism.
- Not according to that definition.
- It takes a certain sort of person. It takes disposition, patience and ability to teach and discipline as well as knowledge — and to do it on an individual basis.
- Skills and knowledge that we pass on are unique — constant challenge from the students keeps teacher on his toes.
- Lay people don't even know the terminology. Tricks of the trade can be acquired.
- Definitely — if everyone possessed my knowledge and skills — children wouldn't need to attend school.
- We need to publicize it more.
- Principles of psychology and learning that lay people often don't know. May always not be applied by teachers. Not enough time to talk about these as teachers.
- Especially in the library! In classroom organization — many people wouldn't know how to set up a unit and carry it out. Knowing how to handle discipline comes from experiences.
- Disagree with definition. Webster says a profession is a calling and I believe teaching is a calling. My job is a matter of imparting an attitude toward life rather than knowledge. We have control of our destinies.

QUESTION 24: (Continued)

- Other professions have a form of autonomy and self-determination that teachers do not have. Long felt that teachers are in a unique situation as professionals because they are answerable to so many groups.
- Knew so little at beginning and each year you grow and develop. Have to really like teaching to stay with it. Regard teaching as my profession even though I help my husband in his business.
- Yes, according to that definition. At times it isn't too professional in things it does: teachers teach out of area whether they want to or not; recertification just to keep a job. Client is getting ripped off which is not professional.
- Do I have to answer that? It's a difficult one. I like to think of myself and my colleagues as professionals, but with definition we have there, I find it difficult to answer.
- Yes, knowledge and ability to impart to others in a meaningful way.
- Could be but often is not — range of competencies.
- There are a lot who know their subject very well; but teaching is a whole other aspect. I know musicians who are very good musicians, but cannot teach. I think teaching is a difficult occupation or profession. I know I come home tired.
- Don't want to go into that, sorry —
- It's not only a profession, it's an art.
- It's a highly skilled profession.
- Some of our "practitioners" are not professionals — but many M.D.'s and lawyers are not competent either. We have had such an explosion of knowledge just since I've started teaching, we should teach more "learning techniques" rather than skills. I thought our TABA social studies one of the most wonderful techniques for this, but so few teachers would implement the program. I am rather discouraged by the lack of regard for what we do accomplish.
- You are asking about skills not generally known to others.
- Good teaching requires expertise, knowledge and psychological, academic, administrative skills. Always changing.
- Specific subject area knowledge — dealings with public and children.
- The definition is incomplete. Teaching is an art and a science.
- Profession provides freedom to make decisions and opportunity to use individual talent and creativity.
- Have a conversation with a layman! Knowledge, awareness, jargon, etc. It's becoming more and more of a profession too. "Everybody thinks they know how to do it and they don't." They don't even begin to understand it.

QUESTION 24: (Continued)

- Sounds good!
- It still is. It could be more professional.
- It fits the definition. There are things the general public doesn't know about teaching.
- I like the definition.
- I am a professional educator. I think my skills are no different from doctor or lawyer (but underpaid). Professional educator is not a rare animal — there are lots of us out there and highly unpublicized. Public has no understanding of what education is all about. It's too complex. We do such a poor job of telling about ourselves that we are very undervalued. I think teachers don't know how to go about it.
- Yes, draws on body of knowledge of learning, children, and the world at large.
- I think it's not only knowledge we pass on — which others may know — it's the techniques we have — to handle problems.
- Definitely. I think sometimes people get lax in image they project — the casualness. We must dress appropriately and act in an appropriate manner. We should know all the answers and how to deal with kids.
- Definitely feel that it is a profession.
- We have knowledge and experience and we give what we know to students. Also, we have experiences and travels that we use to help socialize our students.
- I'd prefer to say "art" rather than profession. To be a good teacher you have to have a talent beyond the ordinary. Like an artist, must be able to draw out from students talent that is there.
- It takes a great deal of skill to be a teacher. Knowledge —
- Teaching is an art form. It takes skills that are unique to every other profession. We must bring to it uniqueness of tools and attitude.
- I don't agree with definition. I would include in definition "someone who functions independently, without structure."
- Individual skills are brought into the profession. Each teacher brings unique skills.
- I don't put too much stock in a word. Teaching is vital, crucial — it determines the future. What you call it doesn't really matter. We may be beyond a profession — we're on top as far as importance.
- I'd like to think I have skills in subject matter that not every person has.
- If teachers could use own skills instead of being forced to use school's training — skills may not be apparent but are there.

QUESTION 25: Do you believe that you will remain in education until retirement?
(PROBE.)

YES —

What other positions or responsibilities would you like to assume?

- None. (5)
- Writing about education — Ombudsman — education in industry — college teaching.
- Stay where I am.
- Hopes the opportunity avails itself. Has been pink-slipped many times.
- Be principal of a school designed especially for gifted. Not likely to happen though.
- Not interested in administration. Would like more flexibility in the schedule to do things, such as visit and consult with others.
- Classroom teaching — like having my own class — don't want anything else.
- Perfectly happy where I am. At retirement I've thought of real estate and being a tour guide. I'd like to be a representative for book companies.
- Classroom coaching.
- Thought of teaching at different grade levels. Don't want to be a principal. We do team teaching — like teaching art. Could teach music — taught private cello lessons.
- Might be laid off. I'd like to sell Kene Herman's reading program. I'd like to be a principal.
- I like what I'm doing! Want to get computers into classroom.
- Director of Elementary Education (now a principal).
- Just like to teach.
- Some day get a Ph.D. — Curriculum Director in small school district.
- Don't want to stay in one position until retirement. Life comes from change. (Grade level, etc., should be considered every three years.) "I like to keep on learning."
- I'd like to remain in education. There was a time when I thought I didn't because I thought I would have to change because of the job market. Now even if I left education I would go into a job-related field. I'd like to get a degree in learning disabilities and work in a resource room.

QUESTION 25: (Continued)

- Happy in the classroom.
- Remain building principal where the kids are. Adults/kids are best of both worlds. Education has a lot to offer and so do I.
- Principal (administrator) — because I like to be captain of own ship and I don't feel that way now.
- Central Office — curriculum — writing articles.
- I've thought about doing other things. Sometimes you get locked in. It's by choice.
- Well, I will probably remain until age 55. Then I might look for alternative career. I've been involved in politics for 17 years — might try that. Real estate — although it's difficult. Might go into something where I can set own schedule.
- No desire to be anything but a teacher!
- Like what I'm doing — no administrative goals — not a leader but a good member — don't like to compete.
- Like to have Central Office experience (Business).
- Would like to keep job as counselor.
- Principal now — I'd like to be Assistant Superintendent (notice I didn't say Superintendent).
- I want a different job every two years. I enjoy moving around in education.
- Other grades — back to grades I taught earlier — administration is not where the action is.
- I'd love to remain in education. I'm happy with what I'm doing, i.e., learning specialist.
- Probably, but go into corporate training.

NO —

WHAT MIGHT YOU DO INSTEAD? (PROBE FOR CAREER FANTASIES, TENTATIVE PLANS, ETC.)

- I won't have the opportunity (tenure). I'll stay around until I get laid off again.
- Anything, a food stand at Tally Hall.
- Haven't thought about it. Nursery school. I'll hold on as long as it lasts.

QUESTION 25: (Continued)

- I'll be in an out -- need a break -- might own business.
- Business -- dealing with computer industry.
- Stock analyst.
- Pursue interior design, business or psychology.
- If I'd get out of teaching, I wouldn't work with kids.
- Don't know.
- Medical or physical fitness.

QUESTION 26: ESTIMATE AGE OF INTERVIEWEE:

- No added responses.

QUESTION 27: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR OBSERVATIONS ABOUT INTERVIEW.

- Interview rushed -- "Had to go to bank."
- Very cooperative -- open.
- Very cooperative -- enthusiastic.
- Asked: "Have you interviewed people who did not ask for service?"
- Very sorry that Northwest Staff Development Center no longer exists -- it will be a real loss to all teachers. Very enthusiastic, positive teacher -- a pleasure to interview.
- Teacher is currently on layoff from Livonia after 11½ years of teaching. She seemed very disenchanted with teaching and stated that this year her feelings and attitude are a lot different than before. However, I think she answered honestly -- trying to retrieve her feelings/experiences of the time she received the service.
- For Question 24 and 25 interviewee responded "don't want to go into that, sorry -- " (time for interview ran out).
- Made enough comments as I answered each one (questions). Again -- thank you for the opportunity.
- Interview in office. Relaxed atmosphere. Friendly.
- Preoccupied.
- Enthusiastic, involved.

QUESTION 27: (Continued)

- Nancy Allan was super! Scholarly. Working knowledge of elementary schools — good resource. Good overview — educational milieu. Grasp of more than curriculum content — knows group process implementation strategies. Super management skills — delivers all of above in a supportive low key manner. (Presented workshops for NSDC).
- Met interviewee late in the day — after kids left. She appeared friendly but tired. She seemed to miss the point of some of the questions and probing didn't seem to help (for example, she felt that she had a great deal of control over her professional development because she could work on her master's degree). Short answers — generally to the point.
- Well dressed — he spoke of the "image of teachers" and he dressed immaculately. His room was decorated with bright posters — even the outside of his room was decorated, the only one in the school. He had a printing press in his room. He mentioned, too, the importance of the environment in the room. He met some students, obviously retarded, while I was there. The friendliness was genuine. There was an affection for each other. He also believes that he should live his own life as he teaches. He is very involved in retarded (special olympics, particularly) and he is a newly elected City Council member. As you can see, he spoke a great deal — often not exactly to the point. But it was obvious to me that here was a man who loved his job and who is working at making a contribution — in his school and in his community. An inspiring man.
- Teacher added that the programs she attended energized her and really served as R&R days when she was able to revitalize herself and come back enthusiastic and invigorated. She feels NSDC and the individualized services will be greatly missed.
- Very helpful — she had been an interviewer for NSDC before.
- Bright — articulate.
- Most enthused about present assignment; worked so hard on the interview.